

# Conference Proceedings



## DCHA/OFDA 21<sup>st</sup> Biennial NGO Conference



## HUMANITARIAN ACTION IN AN INCREASINGLY COMPLEX WORLD

November 21-22, 2002  
Marriott Wardman Park Hotel  
Washington, D.C.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
SUMMARY OF OPENING REMARKS.....	5
SUMMARY OF KEYNOTE ADDRESS.....	6
FRAUD AWARENESS.....	8
USAID/OFDA GUIDELINES FOR PROPOSALS AND REPORTING 2002 .....	9
USAID/OFDA REGIONAL TEAM DISCUSSIONS	
1. Asia and the Pacific.....	12
2. Central Africa (CA).....	13
3. East Africa (EA).....	14
4. Europe, the Middle East and Central Asia (EMCA).....	17
5. Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC).....	19
6. Southern, West, and North Africa (SWAN).....	21
THEMATIC BREAKOUT SESSIONS	
1. Humanitarian Operations in Contaminated Environments.....	24
2. Monitoring and Evaluation Issues and Challenges.....	28
3. Emergency Agricultural Programs: Moving Beyond Seeds and Tools.....	30
4. Civil-Military Coordination and Beyond.....	32
5. OFDA Guidelines for Proposals and Reporting.....	34
6. Security.....	36
7. Promoting Developmental Relief through Settlements Programming.....	38
8. Humanitarian Information Centers.....	41
9. Disaster Mitigation and Prevention.....	45
10. Meeting the Needs of IDPs: An Assessment of Progress to Date.....	48
DCHA PANEL.....	51
DONOR PANEL DISCUSSION.....	55
PARTICIPANTS BIOGRAPHICAL DATA.....	58
LIST OF REGISTRANTS.....	73

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since the last biennial conference USAID was reorganized into four regional bureaus and three pillar bureaus. The pillars are: Global Health; Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA); and Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade. Roger Winter, Assistant Administrator, DCHA, discussed the DCHA reorganization. Len Rogers, Deputy Assistant Administrator, DCHA, presented the newly formed DCHA Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation. In addition, representatives from DCHA's Office of Transition Initiatives, Office of Food for Peace, Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation, and Democracy and Governance presented their portfolios and discussed their cooperation within the Bureau.



*Roger Winter, Assistant Administrator of USAID Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA)*

OFDA has revised its Guidelines for Proposals and Reporting. These changes are intended to facilitate our implementing partners' and OFDA's ability to better fulfill both immediate operational and accountability reporting requirements. To increase transparency and provide OFDA with a more flexible way of soliciting creative solutions to problems, it is increasingly utilizing Annual Program Statements.

*Len Rogers, Deputy Assistant Administrator of USAID Bureau of Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA)*

OFDA continues to promote developmental relief by encouraging its implementing partners to share information with other organizations, incorporate prevention, mitigation and preparedness measures in relief interventions, promote international standards, and build local and international capacity. OFDA stressed the need for the integration of sector programming. For instance, when planning settlements interventions, NGOs need to be aware of agriculture and food security issues, gender, environment, culture, local organizations and social relations as these represent the multi-faceted context of settlements.



Regional teams from OFDA's Disaster Response and Mitigation Division presented their portfolios and issues of focus. Afghanistan and Sudan, as well as countries suffering from protracted complex emergencies remain priorities. A number of countries are affected by the drought in Southern Africa and the Horn of Africa, and OFDA is responding to those needs.

A number of questions focused on the USG's potential military action in Iraq and how this would impact the role of the humanitarian community. OFDA urged NGOs to make sure they were preparing for potential Iraq-related humanitarian assistance needs. OFDA assured attendees that they would share information on those issues through InterAction.

The conference also focused on new issues, new risks, and new technologies facing the NGO community. Several presenters stated that terrorism was our biggest risk and that

traditional emergency responders need to develop new approaches for working on non-traditional events. Humanitarian organizations are entering a new phase in which they may be called upon to provide assistance in conflict situations that include exposure to various contaminants such as chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear hazards.

In this context, the humanitarian community cannot rely upon traditional methods to deliver relief. Humanitarian organizations need to develop new solutions or build on existing ones. NGOs need to plan for ongoing threats, possible contamination, and special medical concerns.

The 21<sup>st</sup> Biennial Conference brought together members of the NGO community, donors and non-traditional humanitarian responders such as the military to jointly explore how to meet new challenges. OFDA appreciates all who participated in the discussions and provided insight into these new challenges.

## SUMMARY OF OPENING REMARKS

### **Bear McConnell, Director, U.S. Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance**

Mr. McConnell opened the conference by thanking the participants for their participation and attendance at the conference. He discussed several steps that have been taken to maximize resources and minimize gaps and redundancies in USAID/OFDA. To improve and increase OFDA's field presence overseas, the Asia office is being transferred from Manila to Bangkok. In Africa OFDA will be opening two new offices in west and southern Africa. A high number of OFDA employees are not direct hires, but personal service contractors, who lack opportunities to progress within OFDA. Career paths of all OFDA employees must be improved. OFDA recognizes the importance of training employees in basic, fundamental survival skills, and basic training is a high priority and OFDA will continue to conduct training to increase the number of deployable staff. Civil/military cooperation is essential and OFDA must work to improve its relations with the military to avoid confusion in terms of responsibilities and leadership.



*Attendees at the OFDA Sponsored 2002 21<sup>st</sup> Biennial NGO Conference*

## **SUMMARY OF KEYNOTE ADDRESS**

### **Ambassador Wendy Chamberlin**

Ambassador Chamberlin opened her remarks by stating that the ground has shifted for everyone in diplomacy and humanitarian work as the world has become more complicated post September 11. Enemies of the United States now reside within the United States creating a sense of insecurity in the homeland. Abroad, however, the U.S. possesses hegemonic strength, both militarily and economically.

Ambassador Chamberlin stressed that ultimately the achievements of humanitarian aid workers will protect Americans in the homeland. She mentioned Joseph Nye's concept of "soft power," or the idea that the strength of the United States does not come from its military and economic power, but its values and values-based leadership, and the force of persuasion that the U.S. has mutual interests with other nations. Through humanitarian work and other such exercises of "soft power," the U.S. can wage a formidable campaign to save lives.

The Ambassador also commended humanitarian assistance for being above politics. She cited the cases of Afghanistan under the Taliban rule and North Korea, both of which have received humanitarian assistance from aid organizations.

Ambassador Chamberlin discussed the importance of long-term development and reconstruction once immediate needs have been met by organizations such as OFDA. A new model is needed to replace the orthodoxy put forth by international financial institutions such as the IMF, that free-market capitalism and revival of the economy are sufficient to guarantee the long-term stability and development of a nation.

Although a consensus has not yet emerged on a new model for development, there are several pre-conditions for development at the national level, which Ambassador Chamberlin outlined. First and foremost, political will is essential to long-term development. With the commitment of the leadership, developing nations must focus on changes in the legal, regulatory, banking and credit, property, political, and educational systems.

Ambassador Chamberlin pointed out that although no particular form of government is necessary to effect these changes, a society's capacity to express and act on feedback at all levels of society is crucial. Top-down development lacks the democratic elements needed to succeed. Democracy allows for the resolution of conflict among economic, social and political interests, and is therefore essential for building a society.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** Can the Ambassador discuss some of the challenges of civil/military cooperation?

**A:** Ambassador Chamberlin noted that the way people process and communicate information has changed and become more complicated due to the excess of available

information. For this reason, people often have imperfect information. She noted the importance of being able to rely on lower level staff for coordination and organization, and to have close cooperation and synergy with the military.

**Q:** How does the Ambassador feel about the concentration of U.S. power in the world?

**A:** Ambassador Chamberlin stressed that America's real power comes from the success of its values and values-based leadership, and not its hard power.



*Ambassador Wendy Chamberlin, USAID Assistant Administrator for the Africa and Near East (ANE) Bureau delivers the Keynote Address*



## **FRAUD AWARENESS**

### **Mary O'Mara, Inspector General's Office**

Ms O'Mara first presented a historical overview of the Office of the Inspector General (OIG), which came into being during the Civil War and was made statutory by Congress twenty-five years ago. Inspector Generals are independent, politically appointed positions with reporting responsibility to the USAID Administrator and to Congress. The major responsibilities of the OIG are to detect and prevent fraud, waste, abuse, and violations of law and to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness within USAID. Currently, there are six regional OIG offices: Manila, Cairo, Dakar, San Salvador, Budapest, and Pretoria. Half of the staff is located abroad, and the other half is in Washington, D.C.

Ms O'Mara explained that the purpose of audits is to look for fraud and intentional violations of laws. An investigation is an authorized inquiry to gather facts. The need for an investigation is usually prompted by allegations from sources (usually employees), which are provided protection by the OIG.

There are several factors that tend to encourage corruption within institutions, namely, the lack of competition, low salaries and/or failure to pay salaries, excessive taxes and customs, and weak accountability. Corruption is discouraged by promoting transparency and accountability, providing adequate compensation, implementing clear and consistent procedures that apply equally to all staff, and maintaining well-articulated and documented decisions and processes.

Fraud is committed through bribery, kickbacks, commissions, gifts/favors, conflicts of interest, false claims and embezzlement, source and origin violations, and failure to meet specifications or "bait and switch" technique. Most people who engage in fraud tend to start on a small scale and gradually commit more serious violations.

There are several indications that an employee may be engaged in fraud and one should look for the following red flags: excessive interest in money or salary; debt level; major lifestyle changes; "most trusted employee" syndrome where an employee has an excessive amount of responsibility and trust within the organization without adequate accountability; frequent visits from strangers at the office; unnecessary cash transactions; overly narrow or broad specifications for contracts; and multiple bids submitted by the same individual.

Fraud and corruption are most effectively prevented by a code of ethics that clearly outlines office procedures and establishes accountability. Additional information on the OIG can be found at [www.usaid.gov/oig](http://www.usaid.gov/oig).



## USAID/OFDA GUIDELINES FOR PROPOSALS AND REPORTING 2002

**Facilitator:** Anita Menghetti, OFDA  
**Presenters:** Georgia Beans, OFDA  
Sureka Khandagle, OFDA  
Giselle Zimmerman, OFDA  
David Lillie, OFDA

Ms Beans provided a brief history of the guidelines, which were developed in 1994 to communicate OFDA's needs to NGOs. The guidelines, which are considered a "living document," were developed through a series of assessments by a Standing Committee composed of OFDA staff, and through feedback from NGOs. The first draft of the revised guidelines was sent to all OFDA staff for comments; submitted to seven NGOs for review; and to OFDA's Senior Management Team for final approval.

One of the most significant changes to the guidelines is that proposals are now limited to 20 pages (excluding cost proposal and annexes). Another important change is the expansion of the results framework, which now links expected results and objectives to relief sectors.

Ms Beans and Ms Khandagle outlined some of the changes in the Guidelines. Overall changes are outlined below:

- **Concept papers:** These should outline objectives, expected results, and preliminary cost estimates in five pages or less. A review of the concept papers is not a guarantee of funding.
- **Coordination and Information Sharing:** There has been a shift in focus from requiring operational information in reports to OFDA to requiring that implementing partners share information in the field. OFDA will monitor compliance.
- **Minimum Technical Information Requirements:** To facilitate "big picture" analysis, OFDA experts have assembled a list of questions covering agriculture, food security, health, nutrition, shelter, water and sanitation, and hydrometeorology. These are periodically updated, and can be found at [www.usaid.gov/hum\\_response/ofda/resources/grants/MTIR](http://www.usaid.gov/hum_response/ofda/resources/grants/MTIR).
- **Objectives/Reporting Sectors:** OFDA prefers that objectives be relief sector specific. NGOs can propose different objectives from those provided in the list on page 19 of the new guidelines. OFDA discourages overly descriptive objectives as they impede administrative program flexibility.
- **Pre-award Letter (PAL):** The name has been changed from "Pre-authorization Letter" to more accurately reflect the expectations in the grant award. A PAL does not constitute a commitment, and any costs incurred prior to award cannot be reimbursed in the event that an award is not made.

Ms Zimmerman discussed the numerous changes to the reporting guidelines. The goal of the changes is to encourage more frequent information sharing, and less frequent complex reporting. NGOs should always consult Attachment One, “The Schedule,” in the award documents for reporting requirements and instructions.

There are four types of reports: program updates, data collection, results reports, and financial reporting.

- **Program Updates:** These are brief, timely, and informal reports on program activities. They are flexible on content and frequency. Examples may be found in Annex G of the guidelines.
- **Data Collection:** This is the information that OFDA needs for Congressional reporting requirements. Five specific pieces of information are required on a quarterly basis. The format for submission of the information will be communicated to organizations before the time of collection.
- **Results Reports:** These are required 90 days after the end of the program, or annually for programs longer than one year. The recommended format of the reports is included in the guidelines.
- **Financial Reporting:** All financial requirements are included in the grant agreement. OFDA may request additional financial information during the course of the program.

Ms Zimmerman concluded by emphasizing that organizations should immediately notify OFDA of any developments that have a significant impact on OFDA-supported programs.

Mr. Lillie noted that the annexes cover indicators, references, guidelines for new applicants, forms, instructions and certifications.

## Questions and Answers

**Q:** Are one-year proposals favored over multi-year proposals?

**A:** The majority of OFDA funds are tied to disaster declarations, which must be redeclared every fiscal year in the case of on-going disasters or complex emergencies. For this reason, OFDA tends to limit engagement to a three, six or twelve month period, and is somewhat constrained by this time frame. Multi-year proposals can be submitted but they will only be funded for one-year or less, based on availability of funding, and NGOs must have a clearly defined exit plan. However, OFDA also values long-range thinking and investment in a population, and welcomes proposals that incorporate long-term objectives. Mitigation funds are not tied to disaster declarations, and can therefore be multi-year grants, although they are still funded incrementally on a yearly basis primarily through Annual Program Statements or Request for Applications. Page 20 of the guidelines addresses program duration.

**Q:** What is the rationale for the separation of the cost and program proposals?

**A:** The two aspects of the proposal are separated because they go to different people within OFDA. When OFDA receives a proposal, the technical aspects are reviewed in terms of cost realism, such as how reasonable it is to achieve the desired results, and are the resources commensurate with the results to be achieved. OFDA assesses both the cost and program aspects of the proposal concurrently, but separates them due to the different staff involved.

**Q:** How does OFDA evaluate proposals in light of its funding?

**A:** OFDA program funding is based on need, and proposals should address the needs of the populations. If adequate funds are not available, OFDA addresses needs to the extent it can.

**Q:** Is there a protocol as to when an APS is used or not?

**A:** There are two competitive ways to request assistance: Request for Applications (RFA) and Annual Program Statement (APS). An RFA is used when USAID knows how it wishes to address a specific issue and seeks a grantee to carry out those objectives. An APS is used when USAID is aware of the problem, and seeks a grantee that can provide the solution. An APS is a more flexible way of soliciting creative solutions to problems. OFDA does not have a strict policy regarding when to issue an RFA or an APS.

## USAID/OFDA REGIONAL TEAM DISCUSSIONS

### 1. Asia and the Pacific

**Presenter: Rob Thayer, Regional Coordinator, OFDA**

Mr. Thayer presented a brief overview of Asia's regional characteristics and disaster vulnerabilities, and described OFDA's organization, activities, and strategy in the region.

OFDA's Asia Regional Team includes five people in the field (plus local administrative staff) and four employees in Washington. In the past five years, most disaster responses have involved hydro-meteorological events such as floods and typhoons, droughts, earthquakes, and complex emergencies (Indonesia and Nepal). One event can greatly increase the spending for the region in a given year. For example, disaster spending for East Timor (2000), the Gujarat earthquake (2001), and the Indonesia Complex Emergency created large spending spikes.

Identifying appropriate disaster preparedness/mitigation activities is more complex than addressing the immediate needs of disaster victims. In Asia, USAID/OFDA tries to target high-impact model activities with regional impact where possible. For example, OFDA is supporting a regional flood forecasting and early warning project in the Mekong River Basin countries. OFDA also works on country-specific programs with countries that have displayed a strong commitment to disaster preparedness such as Vietnam, Bangladesh, and others.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** Are there countries in the Asia region where OFDA would not look at disaster proposals?

**A:** For preparedness/mitigation activities, OFDA believes that its contributions can have greatest impact in countries with a strong, long-term commitment to disaster preparedness. In order for OFDA to provide disaster response assistance, there must be a request for assistance or a clear indication from the host government that assistance would be welcome. Some countries are reluctant to accept international assistance. Additionally, it is sometimes difficult to find partners with access to affected regions due to security reasons, such as in rural Nepal.

**Q:** What is a typical grant budget, and how many projects are undertaken in a normal year?

**A:** Projects and budgets vary widely in terms of size and duration. Current Annual Program Statements can be obtained on the OFDA website.

**Q:** Where in Indonesia is OFDA working?

**A:** OFDA is working throughout the country in responding to both complex emergencies and natural disasters. Our implementing partners are responding to the complex emergency needs in Indonesia, and by their presence in country they are providing OFDA

with information on new assistance needs as they emerge. For example, doctors who were partially funded by OFDA for the Indonesia complex emergency were sent to respond to the October bombing in Bali.

**Q:** Does OFDA fund preparedness activities for non-natural disasters?

**A:** OFDA would like to increase readiness for IDP migration movements. Current APSs for addressing this need can be found on the OFDA website.

## **2. Central Africa (CA) Team**

**Presenters: Tim McRae, Acting Regional Coordinator, OFDA  
Nick Cox, Disaster Operations Specialist, OFDA**

Messrs. McRae and Cox presented a brief overview of the Central Africa Team that covers countries in Central Africa and the Great Lakes, including Burundi, Rwanda, Uganda, and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC).

- **Burundi**

OFDA's strategy in Burundi is to continue to respond to humanitarian needs resulting from the ongoing civil conflict in Burundi focused primarily in the areas of coordination, food security, health, nutrition, and water/sanitation. OFDA is working to strengthen early warning and rapid response mechanisms to mitigate the effects of new and emerging crises.

- **Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)**

OFDA's strategy in the DRC is to focus its programming closest to its core mandate of saving lives of people affected by the declared disaster for DRC. OFDA will focus on the most vulnerable communities and those affected by the 1998 war and other rapidly developing emergencies. The priorities will include programming in the health and food security sectors as well as in coordination, logistics and non-food items.

- **Rwanda**

OFDA has no ongoing programs in Rwanda but continues to coordinate closely with the USAID Mission. In FY 02, OFDA responded to disaster declarations for flooding and meningitis.

- **Uganda**

OFDA's response in Uganda is to address the needs of populations (particularly IDPs) affected by the insurgency of the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) in the north as well as increasing the capacity of communities to cope with increased numbers of displaced persons. OFDA is funding activities in the sectors of health, nutrition, non-food items, and coordination. Currently, access to populations in many of the conflict-affected areas is limited and additional assistance will be considered as access to beneficiaries increases.

## Questions and Answers

**Q:** Why is the funding trend down in Burundi?

**A:** At this time, OFDA projects a decrease in the budget for Burundi but it is too early to tell what sort of assistance package will be needed.

**Q:** The coordination of Malaria programs has been a concern in Burundi. Specifically, MSF's Chief of Party was recently kicked out of the country. What is OFDA doing on that front?

**A:** The donor community has raised the issue and tried to come to consensus on how to proceed. USAID's Regional Economic Development Services Office (REDSO) is looking at a long-term strategy and OFDA will incorporate that strategy into its programs.

**Q:** What is the percentage split between OFDA programs in western DRC versus the eastern part of the country?

**A:** OFDA is providing approximately 80 percent of its funding to NGOs working in the eastern part of the country, while the remaining 20 percent is allocated to programs in the western part of the country.

**Q:** What kinds of activities are taking place in the western DRC?

**A:** OFDA is funding food security, health, and nutrition programs in the West.

**Q:** Is there good coordination with donors and how many partners does OFDA have in DRC?

**A:** OFDA has an excellent relationship with ECHO and often coordinates strategies. OFDA funds roughly 12 different organizations implementing 28 different grants.

**Q:** Will the refugees returning from DRC have a destabilizing effect on Rwanda?

**A:** OFDA continues to monitor the situation and is concerned that refugee influx could have a negative effect on the situation in Rwanda. However, there are many other issues that need to be taken into consideration.

### 3. East Africa (EA) Team

**Presenters:** John Marks, Regional Coordinator, OFDA  
Amy Sink, Disaster Operations Specialist, OFDA  
John Kimbrough, Disaster Operations Specialist, OFDA  
Dennis Warner, OFDA

The presenters gave a brief overview of the East Africa Team portfolio that comprises countries in East Africa, including Sudan, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Djibouti, Kenya, Somalia, and Tanzania.

East Africa consists of countries that are among the poorest in the world and are constantly vulnerable to disasters. The region suffers from protracted large-scale

conflict, widespread population displacements, recurring droughts and, to a lesser extent, floods. Pastoralists are among those most vulnerable to climatic shocks as their livelihoods are increasingly threatened by population growth, environmental degradation, and few options for alternative income sources. In recent years, OFDA has repeatedly responded to the emergency needs of pastoralists in addition to the long-term, war-affected populations.

- **Eritrea**

OFDA continues to closely monitor the humanitarian situation in Eritrea and deployed its Regional Advisor for the Horn of Africa to Asmara to assess the non-food emergency needs. Based on current information, OFDA expects the humanitarian situation in the country to deteriorate due to drought and will work closely with USAID/Food for Peace and USAID/Eritrea to ensure that the immediate emergency needs of the population are met. There has been no declared disaster to date.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** The Prime Minister has stated that at least half of the Eritrean population is facing starvation, but this seems to go against OFDA's strategy for Eritrea. Please respond.

**A:** The Government of Eritrea and the U.N. have disagreed over the number of people affected by the drought situation. USAID's position is that the situation in Eritrea is due in part to climatic conditions, but also because of a large mobilized population, labor shortages, and up to 40 percent of land left unplanted.

- **Ethiopia**

Following the initial October 22 deadline, OFDA has been reviewing proposals submitted in response to its FY 2003 Annual Program Statement (APS) and expects in the coming weeks to fund organizations to provide emergency, life-saving assistance to those drought-affected populations most at risk. In addition, OFDA deployed an Emergency Disaster Relief Coordinator (EDRC) to Addis Ababa to determine OFDA priority areas, and to coordinate assistance with implementing partners.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** Opening up a food corridor during the humanitarian situation in 2000 was a significant issue. Will that be a problem during this situation?

**A:** USAID/FFP is looking at the issue and has deployed a regional food officer to Djibouti to look into the matter. All indications are that the Port of Djibouti will be able to handle most of the need.

**Q:** In FY 2000, OFDA funded seeds and tools programs. Is that being considered this time?

**A:** Through the Annual Program Statement (APS) process, seeds and tools are being considered.

**Q:** What is the donor coordination situation like?



**A:** USAID is coordinating with ECHO, DFID, and other donors such as the Dutch and Swiss. There are plans to have a donor consultative meeting, but no specifics yet. In 2000, USAID coordinated well with ECHO.

**Q:** There seems to be great disagreement as to the severity of the situation in Ethiopia. Claire Short believes one thing, while the Irish government believes another. Any comment?

**A:** USAID believes that the humanitarian situation in Ethiopia is very serious and is trying to convince other donors that the situation requires significant resources.

- **Kenya**

Since 2000, many of OFDA's programs have phased-out or transitioned to more sustainable recovery and mitigation programs. Unless the situation deteriorates, FY 2003 funding is not expected. There has been no declared disaster to date.

- **Somalia**

OFDA's emergency program in Somalia promotes Strategic Objective 6 ("Critical Needs Met for Vulnerable Groups") of the USG Integrated Strategic Plan (ISP) for Somalia, 2001-2003. Humanitarian access will remain the key issue and will thus determine OFDA's, as well as other international agencies', ability to improve conditions for the most-affected populations.

- **Sudan**

OFDA's priorities in FY 2003 will include continuing programs in the sectors of health, nutrition, livestock, and food security. It will also include new initiatives linked directly to the peace process including improving humanitarian access to populations in need, preparing the South for peace, and expanding programs that cross GOS-SPLM front lines to reinforce local reconciliation. If supplemental funding becomes available, OFDA will seek to fund programs in previously inaccessible locations, as well as infrastructure improvements. USAID is in the process of conducting pre-strategy consultations for the 2003-2005 Integrated Strategic Plan for Sudan and expects that a draft version of the ISP will be presented to USAID/Washington in March 2003.

## **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** How involved is OFDA in the licensing of NGOs through the Department of Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC)?

**A:** Several departments are involved in the licensing process, including the State Department. In general, the system is extremely slow. Most of OFDA's implementing partners already have OFAC licenses. The constraint is with implementing partners' development assistance funding provided through USAID/AFR, as well as USAID/Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI). USAID's Sudan Task Force is working with State and Treasury to resolve the issue.

**Q:** What is the U.N.'s role in humanitarian coordination in Sudan?

A: This issue still requires attention because the Government of Sudan recently rejected the U.N.'s choice for Resident Coordinator, insisting that the person be from a "Third World" country. The U.N. Department of Political Affairs is looking to become more involved as well.

#### **4. Europe, the Middle East and Central Asia (EMCA)**

**Presenter: George Havens, Regional Coordinator, OFDA**

Secured from the U.S. Public Health Service, Commander George Havens, OFDA's Europe, Middle East, Central Asia (EMCA) team leader, explained that the EMCA team includes a regional coordinator, two disaster operations specialists, two information specialists, and experts in urban planning, geoscience/natural hazards, and monitoring/evaluation. He then provided an overview of EMCA's FY 2002 activities and future plans for OFDA programs in the EMCA region.

The majority of EMCA funding in FY 2002 was programmed for Afghanistan (\$115 million), with funds also going to the Middle East (\$692,000) and Europe (\$639,000). In Afghanistan, OFDA funding followed a three-part strategy to provide counter famine assistance to vulnerable persons in areas of origin; assist IDPs in camps and spontaneous settlement; and to prepare for eventual IDP returns. Food programs received the largest portion of FY 2002 funding in Afghanistan (26%), followed by agriculture (14%). Other funded sectors included health, shelter, water/sanitation, logistics, and nonfood items.

CDR Havens provided an overview of other OFDA responses in the EMCA region in FY 2002. In Tajikistan OFDA provided \$998,180 for winter seed and fertilizer, and responded with \$50,000 following a flash flood. In the Middle East OFDA provided \$265,000 for relief commodities and technical support to the Jenin refugee camp. OFDA responded to the Iran earthquake by providing \$50,000, and airlifting relief commodities for distribution by the Iranian Red Crescent. OFDA provided \$50,000 in response to a dam break and flooding in Syria.

In Europe and the Newly Independent States, OFDA provided \$50,000 for the Georgia earthquake and \$50,000 for Russia floods. In response to flooding in Europe, OFDA provided \$571,500 to the Czech Republic; and Romania, the Slovak Republic and Albania each received \$50,000 for flood relief commodities.

In FY 2003, Afghanistan remains a priority, though OFDA has a minimal amount of program money compared to 2002. OFDA anticipates supplementary funds, but the Continuing Resolution is in effect until February 11. Program priorities for Afghanistan include emergency infrastructure rehabilitation, emergency shelter, potable water, logistics and coordination, food aid (where appropriate), camp management, and emergency health/nutrition. OFDA is placing greater emphasis on emergency cash for work programs after various assessments found that goods are available within Afghanistan, but Afghans do not have the resources to purchase those goods. OFDA

began working early this summer on a winter strategy for Afghanistan, and has already funded programs to keep the Salang Tunnel cleared of snow during winter and to rehabilitate roads in the west and north to facilitate pre-positioning of commodities for the winter. OFDA's FY 2003 winter strategy is to provide assistance to populations at the village and district level, improve access to remote locations, provide income for vulnerable populations, provide potable water, and a nonfood items contingency capacity.

CDR Havens concluded the presentation with highlights of OFDA's mitigation and preparedness activities in the EMCA region. OFDA supports a community-based Seismic Hazard Mitigation program in Istanbul, and a Central Asia Seismic Hazard Mitigation Program that will be active in Tashkent, Almaty, and Dushanbe, with outreach to other regional cities. OFDA is enhancing disaster preparedness in the region by working with U.S. Missions to improve disaster response procedures, in addition to improving linkages with NGO and U.N. partners. OFDA is monitoring events in Iraq, while analyzing the current humanitarian situation and potential personnel and commodity resource requirements, should a humanitarian response be necessary.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** Does OFDA have infrastructure projects in Kandahar?

**A:** OFDA has partners in the region that are doing small-scale rehabilitation projects through cash for work programs.

**Q:** Is there a way OFDA could circumvent some of the security restrictions that largely confined the DART to Kabul?

**A:** OFDA has tried traveling with DOD units and linking with NGOs, but still has to follow Diplomatic Security restrictions. Nevertheless, OFDA staff has managed to travel to Herat, Bamiyan, and Kunduz.

**Q:** How is OFDA funding determined?

**A:** Congress determines OFDA funding levels and while OFDA has asked for a certain amount, OFDA may get much less than requested. There is still an emergency situation in Afghanistan, but we do not know how much money OFDA would be getting to support OFDA programs in Afghanistan.

## **5. Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC)**

**Facilitator:** Giselle Zimmerman, Disaster Operations Specialist, OFDA  
**Presenters:** Guy Lawson, Regional Advisor, San Jose, Costa Rica, OFDA  
Juan Pablo Sarmiento, San Jose, Costa Rica, OFDA

Ms Zimmerman introduced the panelists and provided an overview of the session.

- **Guy Lawson: LAC program**

Mr. Lawson described how OFDA approaches the LAC region differently from other regions because of its relatively stable governments and institutions, common language, and lack of ethnic divisions. In addition, all of the countries in the region have national disaster organizations, legislation that address disaster management, and most governments are increasingly reluctant to request assistance for small and medium-sized disasters. There are also regional cooperation bodies for disaster prevention, preparedness, and response in Central America and the Caribbean, and there is an initiative for one in South America.

OFDA's engagement with the region is in two areas: (1) response and (2) technical management and training. OFDA's responses are focused primarily on natural disasters and are short-term, approximately three to nine months. If there is a disaster, OFDA works directly with the local authorities and NGOs to support the local structure since its ultimate goal is to strengthen local authorities. In the case of large-scale disaster, OFDA will deploy a Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART), but will still fully integrate itself within the local structure. Training and technical assistance are the major thrust of OFDA's program in LAC. While responses are short-term, training and technical assistance are on-going activities and are constantly adapted to meet the needs of individual countries. These activities are low profile, but have the same goal as responses—to strengthen local capacity.

- **Juan Pablo Sarmiento: Risk Management**

Mr. Sarmiento explained the concept of risk management and how it has developed over the last three years. Risk management looks at risk in a broad way. Since the number of people at risk is growing and this population has the least amount of resources to deal with during a disaster, risk management has become even more important. OFDA's office in San Jose, Costa Rica is working with its partners, NGOs and the U.N., to expose them to the risk management concept. At the Summit of the Americas conference in December 2001 in Costa Rica, participants discussed risk analysis, risk reduction, disaster management, and recovery.

Mr. Sarmiento said that OFDA is looking at different ways to involve NGOs in risk management. He said this is important because NGOs can also be affected by disasters leading to higher costs, delays in the execution of projects, changes in expected results,

and affect the confidence of the donor community. Mr. Sarmiento explained there are various ways risk management can be integrated and implemented.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** Who can we contact in the OFDA/LAC office if we have questions?

**A:** Ms Zimmerman responded that NGOs could either contact her or the Regional Advisors in the Costa Rica office. There is also a sub-office in the Caribbean, in Barbados, that reports to the Costa Rica office.

**Q:** What kinds of programs does OFDA have in Haiti?

**A:** OFDA does not currently have any projects in Haiti, except for a grant with the U.N. Development Program to strengthen community preparedness. Haiti's Civil Protection and the USAID Mission are working on food insecurity.

**Q:** What type of partners are you looking to work with on risk management? Are there any resources for partners?

**A:** OFDA is looking for partners that are not just working on response but who are looking to educate others. OFDA does not currently have resources to work on risk management, but OFDA is trying to get NGOs to examine this issue, if they are not already.

**Q:** Who provides technical assistance?

**A:** OFDA consultants for the office in Costa Rica provide technical assistance when needed. OFDA has consultants based in many of the countries in the region.

**Q:** How does OFDA's technical assistance program work?

**A:** The presenters explained that OFDA has been carrying out its technical assistance program since 1986, and different programs are implemented based on the needs of a country. OFDA's supports a training of trainers program and all courses use the same methodology.

**Q:** Is OFDA involved in Colombia? Does it work with local churches?

**A:** OFDA is not involved in the internal conflict in Colombia, but it does carry out technical assistance and training programs in the country. OFDA works with its key partners in Colombia and does not currently have a direct connection to any churches.

**Q:** Is it a challenge to work with national authorities? Does OFDA provide them with funding?

**A:** OFDA does not directly fund national authorities. OFDA works with groups that exist within a country and supports the local structure.

**Q:** When a disaster occurs, whom should NGOs contact? Does the Mission take the lead?

**A:** NGOs should contact the DART in case of a disaster. The DART or the Costa Rica office will manage a disaster through the Mission. Response activities will be contracted

and administered locally by the Mission, and OFDA/Washington will send funding for response activities.

**Q:** Can you explain the impact of the Central America Mitigation Initiative (CAMI)? Will this be expanded?

**A:** Presenters explained that OFDA is still assessing the impacts of CAMI. OFDA will not provide any additional funding for CAMI, and the Missions will have to assess how they want to follow on this initiative.

**Q:** How can NGOs receive OFDA training?

**A:** OFDA does not train organizations individually but as a group. NGOs interested in training should contact the Costa Rica office.

## **6. Southern, West, and North Africa (SWAN)**

**Presenters: Sureka Khandagle, Regional Coordinator, OFDA  
David Hajjar, OFDA**

Ms Khandagle and Mr. Hajjar provided an overview of OFDA's activities in Sierra Leone, Southern Africa, and Angola and then fielded questions from the NGO community.

The team covers countries of North Africa (excluding Libya, Egypt, and Sudan); West Africa; and Southern Africa. The majority of OFDA assistance is focused on Southern Africa, Angola, and Sierra Leone, but SWAN continues to monitor the humanitarian situation in Liberia, Central African Republic, Congo-Brazzaville, Mauritania, Côte D'Ivoire, and Guinea.

- **Sierra Leone**

In FY 2003, OFDA expects to shift its focus from urban and peri-urban to rural areas focusing on those areas with large resettling populations. Sectors of focus will remain water/sanitation, seeds and tools, supplementary and therapeutic feeding, and primary health care. Where possible, OFDA expects to provide support for agricultural recovery to assist with rebuilding livelihoods and self-reliance among vulnerable populations.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** OFDA's funding level is likely to drop because of a phase-out. Is this because most of the humanitarian needs have been addressed?

**A:** OFDA's long-term objective is to phase-out and hand over development activities to the mission. However, OFDA will continue to provide humanitarian assistance as needed.

**Q:** OCHA representative asked if OFDA is looking at regional funding due to the need to implement broad-based programs.

**A:** OFDA has a structure in place via OCHA's macro-grant, but wants to be flexible to regional issues.

- **Southern Africa**

For the southern Africa region OFDA priorities include provision of seeds to farmers for planting in the next cropping season, encouraging diversification, and the introduction of drought-resistant varieties. OFDA expects to support supplemental and/or therapeutic feeding centers for vulnerable groups, improvement of health surveillance capacity to monitor the impact of the food crisis on basic health indicators, strengthening of national and regional aid coordination and improvement of regional logistics capacity utilization.

OFDA (in support of other emergency health providers) expects to monitor the status of WHO and UNICEF Expanded Program Immunization (EPI) activities to ensure that adequate systems and supplies are in place to handle increased incidence of endemic and other opportunistic diseases that may arise as a result of the crisis. In addition, OFDA plans to support coordination efforts to ensure effective regional coordination is taking place. In the event of widespread population displacement, OFDA expects to support shelter, water and sanitation, emergency nutrition and health interventions.

## **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** What countries will OFDA focus on in FY 2003?

**A:** The primary focus will be on Zimbabwe, and Zambia to a lesser extent. Malawi received the bulk of OFDA resources in FY 2002 and is likely to receive less this fiscal year.

**Q:** It is expected that the drought situation will continue beyond FY 2003 throughout the region? What are the criteria for focusing on Zimbabwe and Zambia?

**A:** USAID's Southern Africa Action Team (SAAT) focuses on six countries in the region. There are strong missions in Malawi, Mozambique, and Swaziland that have reprogrammed development assistance to meet humanitarian needs. In addition, disasters have not been declared for Mozambique and Swaziland in FY 2003 to date.

**Q:** If displacement occurs in the region, specifically in Zimbabwe, what areas are people likely to move to?

**A:** It is expected that the displaced will move towards Zimbabwe's borders, with the potential for five million refugees. In addition, the region experiences normal seasonal migration as well.

**Q:** How would State/PRM liaise with OFDA?

**A:** State/PRM would have the lead on any refugee issues, while OFDA takes the lead on IDPs. OFDA staff regularly talks to State/PRM on issues of mutual interest.

**Q:** Will OFDA's priorities shift during FY 2003?



**A:** When the rains come, the humanitarian community will get a better picture of the situation. Currently, it is expected that there will be a spike in diseases, with a greater need for supplemental and therapeutic feeding programs.

**Q:** How is the dialogue between donors in Zimbabwe?

**A:** The U.S. has worked and will continue to work with other donors to make sure that all areas are covered. The dialogue is ongoing. There have been some successes and some failures. Coordination has been more successful on non-food related issues.

**Q:** In Zimbabwe, how easy has it been to provide non-food items?

**A:** OFDA has already provided more than \$3 million for non-food items in Zimbabwe and is looking to do more. However, there are a number of policy restrictions to work through: U.S. government policy on providing assistance and the Government of Zimbabwe's policy on genetically modified organisms (GMO).

**Q:** What is the situation in Lesotho and Swaziland?

**A:** A disaster has not yet been declared in FY 2003 in Swaziland. OFDA recently responded to the U.S. Ambassador's disaster declaration in Lesotho with \$50,000.

- **Angola**

OFDA support during the coming year is critical in assisting with the resettlement process and assisting populations in rebuilding productive lives and end dependence on humanitarian assistance. OFDA funding will focus on establishing food security and basic public health in newly accessible areas and on resettlement initiatives for the war-affected populations in five central provinces and areas of critical unmet need nationwide.

## **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** Are there resettlement kits for IDPs or returnees from Zambia?

**A:** OFDA's provision of resettlement kits is intended for returnees, IDPs, and ex-combatants.

**Q:** What is OFDA looking to do in the livelihoods sector?

**A:** If funding is available, OFDA will be looking to complement OTI and USAID/AFR funding. OFDA is not looking at micro finance programs.

- **Mauritania**

**Q:** An NGO expressed concern over the humanitarian situation in Mauritania and asked what OFDA is doing in the country.

**A:** OFDA indicated that a disaster declaration is likely and that it is possible that OFDA will conduct an assessment. FFP has been to the area recently and is considering providing emergency food assistance.

## THEMATIC BREAK OUT SESSIONS

### 1. Humanitarian Operations in Contaminated Environments

**Facilitator:** Michele Jennings, OFDA/MLU

**Presenters:** Mark Littlejohn, U.S. Department of Defense, Office of Territorial Security, Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict  
Steve Goodwin, U.S. Department of State/DGS/PM  
Gerald Martone, International Rescue Committee  
Mark Stinson, Relief International  
James Bishop, InterAction  
Ciro Ugarte, Pan American Health Organization  
Joe Hughart, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry

Ms Jennings introduced the session by stating that the new age of terrorism is one of the biggest risks facing the world in the post-Cold War period. In order for humanitarian operations to be successful, traditional emergency responders need to develop new approaches for working on non-traditional disaster events. Although viable operating solutions need to be developed, the humanitarian community can build on existing solutions within the all hazards approach. This approach does not differentiate between a terrorist act and a technological accident. They both elicit a similar response that requires planning for unique circumstances such as ongoing threats, contamination, decontamination, and special medical concerns.

- **Colonel Mark Littlejohn, U.S. Department of Defense, Office of Territorial Security, Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict**

Colonel Littlejohn spoke about what the Department of Defense (DOD) is doing to prepare for and operate in Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear or Explosive weapons of mass destruction (CBRNE) events. DOD is making preparations to detect, operate, and protect soldiers in a CBRNE event at all operational levels. Although the U.S. Department of State (DOS) is in charge of coordinating the response to a CBRNE event, DOD can provide search and rescue teams, establish hospital units, and develop medical countermeasures until other U.S. Government agencies can be deployed. However, the level of DOD involvement in any CBRNE event may be limited by other simultaneous DOD operational activities.

- **Steve Goodwin, U.S. Department of State/DGS/PM**

Mr. Goodwin stated that the DOS is prepared to coordinate and respond to industrial accidents, natural disasters that cause a CBRNE event, and acts of terrorism. However, because the DOS has few direct operational assets to provide, they must work with other USG partners to ensure an effective and coordinated response. Response decisions are made at the highest levels of the DOS and usually within a few hours of the event occurring. With the establishment of the new Homeland Security Department, the DOS

will need their approval for moving USG assets to international CBRNE disaster events. The exchange of information between USG agencies will become increasingly important as the need to effectively deploy medical equipment, medicine, and technical specialists increases. Preparedness is critical in surmounting the challenges ahead, especially as terrorist acts will be attacking local populations rather than armies. Determining acceptable levels of success in these types of responses will be difficult, but all responses will require effective coordination between the affected country's government and the responding agencies.

- **Gerald Martone, International Rescue Committee**

Mr. Martone suggested that NGOs plan and educate themselves about working in contaminated environments rather than remain on the sidelines of CBRNE responses. NGO responders may be working in chemical or biological affected regions of Iraq where more than one million people may become displaced. The major responsibilities for NGOs in Iraq will be protecting water sources and building latrines as the water/sanitation sector is in a state of disrepair, with 13 water treatment plants inoperable. If there is a forced migration from urban areas, a mass communications campaign will be required to explain where those displaced need to go if attacked and what assistance to expect in the areas where they relocate. However, NGOs are concerned that they remain uninvolved in the information dissemination campaign to maintain their impartiality. Rumor control will be critical, as populations often tend to overreact to deteriorating events. Mr. Martone predicted that more Iraqis would perish because of ballistic attacks than from exposure to chemical or biological warfare.

- **Dr. Mark Stinson, Relief International**

Dr. Stinson reported that Relief International (RI) had recently contacted 14 NGOs to assess their current levels of preparedness and planning for CBRNE events. Of the 14 organizations surveyed, eight indicated that they had no plans or preparations in place and an additional four organizations did not respond. Of the two remaining organizations that responded affirmatively, one had developed domestic CBRNE preparedness activities while the other organization had established a limited capacity to decontaminate people exposed to some CBRNE agents. Dr. Stinson concluded from his survey that there is a current lack of preparedness capacity, NGOs are not sharing CBRNE preparedness information, and that there is an absence of a common vision on appropriate NGO CBRNE skills, equipment, and levels of acceptable risk.



*Humanitarian Operations in Contaminated Environments Panel from l-r: Capt. Joe Hughart, Dr. Ciro Ugarte, James Bishop (obscured), Dr. Mark Stinson, Gerald Martone, Steve Goodwin, Col. Mark Littlejohn*

There is a growing NGO recognition of the need to develop adequate CBRNE capacities to ensure staff safety rather than relying on the past evacuation-only strategy. With a lack of clarity as to the focal points within the U.S. Government and military branches for assistance and technical support, RI is developing a CBRNE training curriculum, identifying material suppliers, and outlining related humanitarian priorities and modus operandi for its staff and will share its information with other NGOs and emergency first responders in Iraq. Firm guidelines need to be established for all NGOs entering potentially dangerous humanitarian situations, but they may not be uniform as each NGO must determine its own level of risk and vulnerability to litigation should staff die or suffer from long-term disabilities.

- **James Bishop, InterAction**

In December 2001, InterAction's Disaster Response Committee and OFDA agreed to form a working group to understand the nature of CBRNE responses. The working group came to the conclusion that most of the disaster response activities required after a CBRNE event will occur outside the contaminated zones. That is, affected populations will require shelter, potable water, emergency food, health care, clothing, and sanitation after they flee or are moved from the contaminated zones to the decontaminated recovery areas. With technical input from DOD, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, U.S. Public Health Service, Environmental Protection Agency, and the DOS, the working group was able to demystify the consequences of an international CBRNE event and focus attention on how emergency responders will function and assist affected populations outside the contaminated zones. The recent task of the working group is to raise the awareness of the participants while contacting other NGOs that may be involved in responding to an international CBRNE event. However, even with the threat of military action against Iraq, NGOs have not been convinced of the need to train their staffs in self-protective measures and in the decontamination of affected populations. Mr. Bishop asked NGO participants to join the working group and help position their organization to meet the CBRNE threats that they may not be able to avoid in the future.

- **Dr. Ciro Ugarte, Pan American Health Organization**

Dr. Ugarte stated that the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) started training for biological, chemical, and radiological events 12 years ago. After September 11, 2001, PAHO organized a task force to provide guidance and coordination to Central and South American countries that may experience bio-terrorist incidents. The working group for the bio-terrorism task force meets at PAHO headquarters in Washington, D.C., and includes a representative from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Most of PAHO's member countries are facing many public health risks, including the consequences of terrorism.

With a lack of resources for preparedness and hazards prevention initiatives, PAHO has taken a multi-sectoral and interdisciplinary approach in linking biological, chemical, and radiological hazards with preparedness in the health sector to obtain the most impact. In building an overall response capacity, it is impossible for a country to be ready for every

single scenario. Therefore, PAHO is advising member governments to address the consequences of the health risk rather than whether its cause was accidental or intentional. By working with the Ministry of Health's disaster program and national disaster coordination office, government officials should establish a network for the early reporting of bio-terrorist events and its health impacts to allay rumors and fears within the affected areas. The best remedy against the population's "anxiety" is to provide extensive updated (Internet) information on the government's measures and status of the situation. More than ever, governments and relief organizations in the region will need to rely on their collective resources and technical specialists to disseminate information about a bio-terrorism incident and its health impacts.

- **Captain Joe Hughart, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry**

Captain Hughart explained that he also was in the Washington D.C. area to train and prepare OFDA staff in Tier II CBRNE events. Tier II training includes both classroom instruction and a hands-on practicum where participants don and test CBRNE personal protection equipment. On December 11-13, 2002, the Tier II training would be expanded to include NGO staff for the first time.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** Are any NGOs developing standard protocols for working in hazardous CBRNE environments?

**A:** According to Dr. Stinson, there are no standard protocols or guidelines at this time although the issue is being discussed among NGO emergency responders. No group has become the focal point and each NGO organization is drafting its own standards for engagement in a CBRNE event. The OFDA/InterAction CBRNE working group is formulating recommendations on personal protective equipment and training. However, NGOs must establish guidelines and protocols for when their staff enters a CBRNE event and when they are expected to escape the hazard. NGO staff should not be expected to work in a contaminated zone and will be evacuated if they are caught in a CBRNE event.

**Q:** How are NGO staff going to be able to ground truth a CBRNE event?

**A:** Mr. Martone indicated that NGO staff should be responsible for taking care of civilian populations after they evacuate the contaminated zone rather than working on technical interventions. There are too many liability issues at this time for NGOs to be establishing their operations within the contaminated zone. Dr. Stinson reported that there is no central source for up-to-the-minute information on a CBRNE event or knowing when to evacuate staff. Mr. Goodwin stated that the DOS, as the U.S. Government's coordinator for CBRNE events, is beta testing an unclassified consequence management website that will be available to NGOs and the public for updating the status of a CBRNE event. Captain Hughart indicated that OFDA will have access to technical information through its relationships with both ATSDR and CDC, and will be able to make recommendations and characterize situations. This information would be shared with OFDA's implementing partners and the NGO community.

## **2. Monitoring and Evaluation Issues and Challenges**

**Facilitator:** Juanita Rilling, Team Leader, Enhanced Planning Team, OFDA

**Presenter:** Hugh Goyder, Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP)

In introducing this session, Ms Rilling stated that OFDA needed to get accurate beneficiary data from its partners because of the numerous requests for information OFDA receives from Congress. As a result, OFDA changed the reporting requirements in the Grants Guidelines to reflect the need for numbers of beneficiaries and to report those numbers by sectors. Ms Rilling introduced Dr. Goyder who has been working with the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP) to improve ALNAP's monitoring and evaluation process.

- **Dr. Hugh Goyder, ALNAP**

Based in London, ALNAP is an international forum composed of 50 members, aiming to improve learning, accountability, and quality across the humanitarian sector. Dr. Goyder described the purpose of his study and its context. Monitoring issues have received relatively less attention than evaluation issues in ALNAP. The purpose of the study is to achieve a better understanding within ALNAP about monitoring systems, and how they can ensure longer-term learning and prompt course correction.

Dr. Goyder described monitoring as the systematic and continuous assessment of a piece of work over time. The key purpose of monitoring is to help everyone involved make appropriate and timely decisions in order to improve the overall quality of the program. Monitoring covers both situation monitoring and performance monitoring. Performance monitoring usually looks at inputs and outputs; processes such as the extent of participation; impacts, (both negative and unintended impacts); and strategies.

Monitoring can be done through a combination of formal and informal, written and verbal, prescriptive and participatory methods. Dr. Goyder indicated that monitoring reports could be used for learning purposes, for immediate and longer-term learning; for reporting internally or externally; and for performance or situation monitoring.

Dr. Goyder's findings included the following: monitoring was most often undertaken for reporting purposes, monitoring was often under resourced in organizations and given less priority than either reporting or evaluation, and organizations were facing an increased burden of reporting both internally and externally especially in U.N. agencies. Some questions that were raised from Dr. Goyder's study were (1) how can data quality be improved both in performance monitoring and situation monitoring, and (2) do evaluations focus too much on performance in a particular response, or should they focus more on the monitoring systems themselves and how well these worked.

Dr. Goyder concluded by saying that in order to be successful, organizations must make monitoring for learning a priority by encompassing clear systems of support, providing

resources, having strong internal feedback systems through individual incentives and information verification, and competent staff.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** What does monitoring for learning mean for the internal education of the agency and for its own performance? OFDA has a lot of monitoring but no one is putting it together. There is collective knowledge of the agency, but there is no system to collect it.

**A:** How monitoring is organized in an agency is key. Monitoring should be built into every person's job description. You need to look at how employees are utilized. Monitoring should not be the responsibility of one person. It is everyone's responsibility.

**Q:** In rural development, can technology be used for monitoring?

**A:** GIS technologies could be used in monitoring, as well as Humanitarian Information Centers. There needs to be wider accountability between agencies and an incentive for sharing information. In the field, monitoring is done for different reasons. In short term relief activities, quantitative numbers are difficult to get.

**Q:** What do you mean by impact?

**A:** Impacts can be the following: keeping people alive; the incidence of wasting is not getting worse; providing an account of issues (accountability); loss of equipment, stealing. OFDA does not fund large assessments but we need baseline data. A baseline survey can be a two-page description of the situation at the time an NGO starts working in the area. You describe the situation that you are trying to change. NGOs can budget a line item for evaluation in the proposal if it's going to be for a long-term project, (usually one percent of the budget).

**Q:** Can you give a food related example for a baseline?

**A:** Describe the cost of wheat, how much it cost to move it, the distribution process, wastage, theft, how much wheat people received, was it the right kind of wheat?

**Q:** USAID has asked OFDA whether crude mortality rate (CMR) and wasting can be indicators of humanitarian assistance. Peter Morris queried participants on their views about this.

**A:** These indicators cannot be used as performance indicators unless appropriate. CMR is highly specific. It tells you that things are not getting worse. However, it does not tell you a lot about food security. Those two indicators would not have showed up in Kosovo or Hurricane Mitch. They are not indicative of humanitarian emergencies. Measuring weight/height brings expectations that you are going to be doing something in the community because you are bringing in equipment. MUAC (mid upper arm circumference), a method used to screen young children for malnutrition, is faster and does not bring the same expectation of assistance to the community.



### **3. Emergency Agricultural Programs: Moving Beyond Seeds and Tools**

**Facilitator:** Raymond Myer

**Presenters:** Arturo Martinez, Chief of Service, Seed and Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture at the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)  
Louise Sperling, Seed System and Agro-biodiversity Specialist from the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)  
Angela Ravens-Roberts, Director of Academic and Training Programs, The Feinstein Famine Center, Tufts University

Raymond Myer facilitated the presentation by three notable scholars and practitioners in emergency agriculture on the topic of moving beyond emergency seeds and tools programs. Each presenter discussed their topic and then fielded questions from the audience.

- **Arturo Martinez, U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)**

UN/FAO follows guidelines established in the Global Plan of Action, Convention of Biological Diversity, and Cartagena Protocol on BioSafety as the foundation of its emergency agriculture response and, in particular, its approach to seeds and tools. Some of the techniques include assisting local farmers in disaster areas, supporting seed distribution and production, and following Articles 7, 8, and 14 on the Convention of Biological Diversity. Some aspects to consider during an emergency response include total crop failure by farmers, displacement, ability to plant according to climatic timeframes, stocks stolen or destroyed as a result of civil strife, and IDPs returning to planting areas. In general, the problem is not the availability of seeds, but a farmer's capacity to access seeds. UN/FAO is particularly interested in assisting farmers in prevention and preparedness activities, as well as establishing early warning systems to alert farmers of pending situations.

- **Louise Sperling, International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)**

Studies by the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) have provided interesting results that should allow for a reexamination of the provision of seeds and tools during an emergency. CIAT found that in the case of Kenya in 1997 that the informal seed sector comprised two thirds of a farmer's seed source. Similar studies in Rwanda at the height of the humanitarian situation in 1994 show that as much as 70 percent of seeds are sourced from local markets, while the international humanitarian community provided only 28 percent of seeds during the crisis. The conclusion the local seed sector is therefore much more durable than originally thought, and the issue in many situations is access to seeds not availability.

Additional studies have shown that free seed distribution is undermining the market and creating dependency. Seed voucher systems are an effective alternative to the

distribution of free seeds during a crisis. In conclusion, seeds and tools can no longer be viewed as acceptable “default” responses in times of crisis.

- **Angela Ravens-Roberts, The Feinstein Famine Center, Tufts University**

The Feinstein International Famine Center is looking at ways that communities manage risk and vulnerability of their seed management systems during times of crisis. Components of this include understanding ways that institutions and policies interact, as well as how individual members of the community build up their assets. Historically, donors have utilized seeds and tools interventions in response to livelihood emergencies because of their high profile and perceived impact. However, evidence now indicates that the reverse should be taking place. Current trends indicate that access to seeds, understanding local knowledge systems, and revising seed assessments to incorporate local systems is important in shaping seeds and tools programs.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** What is the difference between genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and hybrid seeds?

**A:** The major difference between GMO seeds and hybrid seeds is in the production. By definition, GMO plants contain genes from a different species. This is how, for example, you might get the genes for resistance to a pesticide out of a grass and combine it with a plant like soybean. Hybrid seeds are seeds that are produced by plant breeding. This occurs when you take one variety of soybean and cross it with another variety to produce a hybrid generation that has the genes you want.

GMO seeds will probably breed true and be consistent from generation to generation, as long as they are self pollinated. Hybrid seeds are hard for farmers to save because they will not breed true and therefore will not produce consistently good offspring. Hybrid seeds would need to be replaced from generation to generation.

**Q:** It appears that donors have failed to address the seeds and tools issue in the pre-disaster stage. Any comments?

**A:** Funding for pre-disaster assistance has always been difficult. In addition, the tropics have always been a difficult farming system.

**Q:** Is there any reason to think that giving out free vouchers will create the same type of dependency observed in traditional seed programs?

**A:** Seed vouchers and seed fairs are just one type of intervention. Since seeds provided through local sources mean that financial transactions stay within the community, it is doubtful that the same level of dependency will be observed. NGOs should embrace this new approach and continually ask themselves if the system is working or not.

**Q:** Have there been any examples or studies that examine if fairs and vouchers can be used to restock other assets after the initial phase of a disaster?

**A:** A representative from SCF/US indicated that in Mozambique a system was set up so that individuals could use vouchers to purchase items like machetes, plastic sheeting, etc. This system is viewed as a success and also helped to promote seed trading.

**Q:** Based on the CIAT studies, what percentage of the local seed system attributable to the free relief seeds ended up on the market anyway?

**A:** In the Rwanda study the assumption is that there was no harvest due to the disaster that occurred during the harvesting season. During the worst time, little if any seeds from the international community were provided, so the 70 percent figure is accurate. In addition, evidence suggests that the formal seed sector collapsed immediately, while the local sector continued to function.

**Q:** At a seed fair, isn't a local farmer more likely to purchase a "formal" sector seed instead of a "local" seed because it is likely to produce a higher yield?

**A:** Evidence suggests that at seed fairs farmers often try to diversify their purchases. Farmers will often purchase a formal seed for the first time to compare it to seeds they are used to, and then will use the rest of their vouchers to purchase local seeds.

#### **4. Civil-Military Coordination and Beyond**

**Facilitator:** Steve Catlin, OFDA/MLU

**Presenters:** Mark Walsh, The Center for Humanitarian Cooperation  
Michael Gray, State/PRM

Steve Catlin from OFDA's Military Liaison Unit moderated the session, and started by noting OFDA's coordination with the U.S. military during humanitarian responses in Kosovo, Turkey, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Honduras. He introduced the presenters and asked them to discuss the positive impact of civil-military relations, lessons learned, and the challenge of coordination.

- **Mark Walsh, The Center for Humanitarian Cooperation**

Mark Walsh explained that he is based at CENTCOM in Tampa where he represents humanitarian organizations, including U.N. agencies. During Coalition operations in Afghanistan, his position within CENTCOM allowed him an unusual degree of access to the military leadership and unique opportunities for information exchange. Mr. Walsh's location at CENTCOM facilitated discussion on topics affecting both civil and military actors, such as airdrops, location of mines and unexploded ordnance, and NGO objections to soldiers in civilian clothing. He noted that the timeliness and accuracy of information sharing at the height of the war was a challenge due to the high volume of incoming information. He also felt there was minimal understanding of humanitarian operations among military staff, though their knowledge increased over time.

Mr. Walsh explained that the military's organizational structure presented other challenges. The military personnel working on Afghanistan were constantly changing,

making it difficult to establish a consistent point of contact. The range of military actors involved also complicated efforts to find the right person to provide information.

To improve coordination, Mr. Walsh suggested early cooperation between civil and military actors prior to a disaster. He noted the importance of communicating one's role to others to improve organizational clarity and coordination. He also recommended an established communication schedule so all parties know to meet or call at a particular time. Overall, he was pleased with the close relations between civil and military actors through their shared location at CENTCOM.

- **Michael Gray, State/PRM**

Michael Gray, who also worked on Afghanistan at CENTCOM, stated that the civil-military operation in Tampa was the first of its kind and did not follow a set doctrine or have an established mechanism. Although inter-humanitarian agency working group (IHAWG) meetings after Kosovo tried to determine better ways for civil and military groups to work together in the future, these lessons were not implemented because of the crisis-driven nature of the Afghanistan response. However, one change that did emerge during Kosovo was the relationship between IOs, NGOs, and the military, with the IOs and NGOs seeking out assistance from the military and the three groups increasingly working together. This came about from the relationships developed at the headquarters level between the U.N. and the military at the planning stages, and routine consultations between the two. Because of this relationship, the staff at CENTCOM reached out to the U.N. early into the Afghan crisis and, unlike previous operations, brought U.N. staff to Tampa. Mr. Kennedy from UN OCHA and General Franks were receptive to meeting with one another. Mr. Gray felt that civil-military coordination mechanisms could be established more easily now that these relationships are in place.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** The panelists did not address some of the problems between NGOs and the military, such as issues of neutrality and the military role in reconstruction projects traditionally managed by NGOs. What is the direction of the U.S. military role?

**A:** The panelists responded that the military is often confused about what the NGOs want. The panelists suggested that NGOs decide on their relationship with the military and devise a strategy to clarify that relationship, especially since military involvement in humanitarian options is a current reality. They reiterated that it was helpful to have an NGO representative at CENTCOM during the Afghanistan response.

**Q:** An NGO followed up on the issue of neutrality, noting the importance of having a clear division between the political sphere and the humanitarian sphere, and a separation between combatants and non-combatants as specified by the Geneva Conventions. He said humanitarians fear that military cooperation will compromise humanitarian access to all parties and the ability to negotiate with all parties.

**A:** Bear McConnell, OFDA Director, made the point that we do not know what the military plan for future contingencies is, and that the military most likely would not involve humanitarian agencies during active conflict.

**Q:** Jim Bishop from Interaction explained that NGOs had been working to improve understanding with the military, but relations changed with the Afghan war when Powell called on NGOs to extend the foreign policy objectives of the U.S. government. Mr. Bishop stated that Afghanistan was a different operating environment, so there was less civil-military understanding. Another NGO representative added that the military was arguing for a greater role in humanitarian action to further U.S. political goals.

**A:** A DOD representative responded that the military made a special effort in Afghanistan to prevent tragedies during combat and minimize impact, such as avoiding unnecessary bombing that would damage roads. (NGO participants pointed out the U.S. bomb damage to ICRC and WFP warehouses in Afghanistan). The DOD representative went on to explain that the military tries to give back to the community in which they are operating, and the involvement of U.S. forces in humanitarian programs in Afghanistan was a large-scale example of this tradition. The DOD representative ended by noting that the military listened to the NGO community when they requested that Special Operations soldiers wear a uniform to distinguish themselves from NGO workers.

Michael Smith from the U.S. Army said that the military is not a monolith, but has a variety of organizational structures and methods of operating. He added that the military is not trying to take over the work of NGOs, but was trying to “win the hearts and minds” of Afghans in order to get information. He ended by saying that the military was involved in humanitarian affairs before the profusion of NGOs in the past 50 years.

## **5. USAID/OFDA Guidelines for Proposals and Reporting**

**Facilitator:** Georgia Beans, OFDA

**Presenters:** Anita Menghetti, OFDA

Sureka Khandagle, OFDA

David Lillie, OFDA

Gizelle Zimmermann, OFDA

Since a plenary session had already been devoted to the revised Grant Guidelines, Ms Beans suggested that the participants might wish to utilize this session to field questions from the presenters. The participants agreed.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** When do you write a results report?

**A:** Results reports are final reports. If it is a multi-year program, results reports are done on an annual basis.

**Q:** When do we provide program updates?

**A:** It is in lieu of quarterly reporting, and the frequency is up to each Disaster Operations Specialist (DOS).

**Q:** Where do we send program updates?

**A:** Program updates should be sent to OFDA Washington.

**Q:** How long should data collection be and in what format?

**A:** An excel spreadsheet is acceptable. OFDA will advise on the format.

**Q:** Who will be getting the data?

**A:** The monitoring and evaluation team will be gathering the data. NGOs will be advised by email as to what information will be required.

**Q:** Does this new reporting set-up apply to current grants?

**A:** Current grants will transition to the new requirements as they come up for new action funding. For new grants this is effective immediately.

**Q:** Will technical assistance be provided to NGOs? There is some discrepancy between expected results and reporting on performance.

**A:** We expect to have additional information forthcoming to elaborate further and clarify the difference between the different types of reports. We will shortly be rewriting those sections of the grant providing details on reporting requirements. It is not anticipated that any technical assistance will be provided and that the forthcoming directions will be clear.

**Q:** For proposal evaluation are we required to have a monitoring plan?

**A:** The monitoring plan does not need to be included in the proposal, but NGOs are required to have one. See p. 23 of the Guidelines. You should also have an appropriate start date that should be reflected in the front page of the proposal.

**Q:** Why use email and not couriers?

**A:** This is a security issue in the Ronald Reagan Building. The security desk will not allow anyone to leave a package. If the recipient of the package is not available for personal delivery (not reachable when the security officer calls), the package gets turned back. OFDA would prefer to receive proposals by email, followed by a hard copy by mail. OFDA requests that you change the date on the proposals with each review to facilitate discussion about which version and page number is under discussion.

**Q:** If there has been no disaster declaration, will you accept proposals?

**A:** In the LAC region, most of the funding is mitigation and preparedness. For natural disasters, legislation mandates that a disaster must be declared before OFDA can provide international disaster assistance. Approximately 10 percent of OFDA's budget is allocated to mitigation and preparedness programs. Most of the mitigation programs are awarded through an Annual Program Statement (APS) process.

**Q:** How do we find out who was awarded a grant under the APS process?

**A:** Awards are posted on the USAID website.

**Q:** You only have 30 days to submit a proposal under an APS. Is this normal?

**A:** The standard is 45 days, but 30 days is normal. Some APSs have more than one deadline or a rolling deadline. If responding to an APS, NGOs need to follow the APS guidelines not only OFDA's Grants guidelines. APSs provide for increased transparency, and give OFDA the best program for the money.

**Q:** When would OFDA provide funding for an assessment and under what conditions?

**A:** OFDA sees assessments as a cost of doing business. Funding would be provided under extraordinary circumstances; it is rarely done.

**Q:** Are there guidelines on needs assessments?

**A:** During an emergency a Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART) is usually on the ground to conduct a needs assessment in order to determine the types of needs. The DART communicates with other donors and tries to leverage funding. In on-going disasters, OFDA has Emergency Disaster Response Coordinators (EDRCs) who assess needs. OFDA is not looking for sophisticated assessments. Please read the Guidelines and refer to the glossary for explanations of our terms.

## **6. Security**

**Presenters: Randy Martin, International Rescue Committee (IRC)  
Bobby Lambert, RedR  
James Bishop, InterAction**

Bobby Lambert introduced the panelists and provided a short introduction to the topic.

- **Randy Martin, IRC**

Mr. Martin discussed NGO security challenges and the lessons learned from IRC security programs. NGOs face a number of common institutional security challenges, including: (1) Lack of funding: NGOs are rarely able to afford a full-time security advisor; (2) poor information sharing: systematic threat analysis and reporting are rare; (3) poor communications: if existent, emergency channel usage is often unreliable; (4) poor training: if existent, training of national and international staff is weak; (5) poor interface with U.N. agencies, (7) no chain of responsibility: the U.N. has no responsibility for NGO security.

Recognizing these issues, IRC started two pilot projects designed to enhance NGO security. For its first project, State/PRM funded the creation of an IRC-trained Field Security Advisor (FSA) for UNHCR in Guinea. This position improved access to the U.N. and created a credible, neutral entity to deal with security issues. Still, the project was costly and challenged by the initial distrust of NGOs and U.N. bureaucracy. Despite



these obstacles, the FSA provided hundreds of hours of training, countless consultations, and many other security services. For the second project, ten NGOs (AirServe, CARE, CWS, Concern Worldwide, ICRC, IMC, IRC, Mercy Corps, Save the Children, and World Vision) combined forces to develop a pilot security program in Afghanistan. A survey of 34 NGOs operating there found that only three NGOs had full-time security individuals, and one third had no security plan at all. Based on these findings, project objectives were set to include: (1) creating a forum for regular security meetings, (2) serving as a hub for security information management, (3) providing advice and analysis on security issues, (4) providing liaison with international military organizations and national authorities, (5) conducting security training, (6) creating and maintaining a security communications system, and (7) strengthening telecommunications systems.

- **Bobby Lambert, RedR**

Mr. Lambert briefly described RedR's background and capabilities. He emphasized that security should be an important priority for NGO upper management. RedR provides expertise, training, and support to humanitarian organizations. Partially funded by OFDA, RedR provides standardized and custom training, and materials for security management and staff. RedR provides access to trainers and maintains a register of NGO security specialists. Training materials available on security issues include books, videos, and a DVD in the near future. RedR has found success in its participatory approach to training, which allows the improvement and expansion of training courses to meet the needs of trainees.

Security is an important responsibility of upper management and the Boards of Trustees at NGOs. Funding is important to improving security, but time must also be given during the workday to develop stronger security. RedR promotes the mainstreaming of security as an integrated activity in a program, rather than an add-on. When management focuses on security, it becomes not just a cost, but also an investment.

- **James Bishop, InterAction**

Mr. Bishop reviewed InterAction's security work and its current initiative, the establishment of a security coordinator.

In the aftermath of the 1994 crisis in Goma, there was a consensus that security needed to be improved. With OFDA encouragement, InterAction created the Security Advisory Group (SAG) from a broad group of security experts to design a security course. After the new course was successfully piloted, OFDA awarded a grant to RedR to present it. Thousands of NGO field staff, both international and national, have benefited from the course. The SAG has continued its work on security improvement through a number of initiatives. For example, the SAG created guidelines for the preparation of individual agency security plans, which became an annex to OFDA's basic guidelines for those preparing project proposals. To stimulate the interest of upper management in security, the SAG designed a security seminar for CEOs. In addition, the SAG prepared a set of

“essential steps for the security of national employees” which now has been incorporated into InterAction's PVO standards.

The SAG is now creating a security coordinator position within InterAction with funding from OFDA. The security coordinator will facilitate security measures in the field, coordinate security activities, develop a set of minimum security standards for InterAction, undertake activities to improve security for female workers, and implement a new relationship with U.N. agencies.

## **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** What topics are covered in RedR security training courses?

**A:** Security training courses offered by RedR provide management with the tools to evaluate security and set up adequate security procedures in the field. The utility of specific skills (defensive driving, landmines, road-blocks) varies. Custom training for these skills is also provided.

**Q:** A number of questions focused on how smaller NGOs with limited budgets can increase security.

**A:** OFDA responded. There needs to be an institutional commitment to security. Smaller NGOs can focus on security by providing incremental funding, but if security is listed as a line item, it may be cut. Instead, security costs should be included in overhead. OFDA will pay for radios and other add-ons, but at some point OFDA will ask what the partner is contributing toward their staff's security.

**Q:** When will InterAction have the Security Coordinator position filled?

**A:** The Security Coordinator will start in mid-January.

## **7. Promoting Developmental Relief through Settlements Programming**

**Facilitator:** Rick Hill, Director of Emergency and Transition Programs,  
Cooperative Housing Foundation

**Presenters:** Laura Powers, Agricultural and Food Security Coordinator, OFDA,  
Technical Assistance Group (TAG)  
Marion Pratt, Social Science Advisor, OFDA, Technical Assistance  
Group (TAG)  
Jim Smith, Geoscience Advisor, OFDA, Technical Assistance Group  
(TAG)

- **Rick Hill, Cooperative Housing Foundation**

In his introduction to the topic, Mr. Hill stated that settlements' location, development plan, rate of growth, strength of their economies, and how well they are managed, especially in times of crisis, will largely determine whether they become the sites of future disasters, and will require USG assistance. Settlements programming should be

multi-sectoral. It should reflect the multi-faceted context of the settlements, be cognizant of gender, the environment, local organizations, social relations, be transitional –linking relief to development; and accountable to local governing structures.

- **Laura Powers, OFDA/TAG**

Ms Powers addressed agricultural and food security issues related to settlements. She discussed urban agriculture's response capability to disasters and economic crises. Urban agriculture is usually a response to economic hardship and undertaken by the poor. It provides for fresh vegetable products in urban centers, increases nutrition and diversifies the diet, and is income generating especially for the women and children who are responsible for it. In cities, urban agriculture supplements household food security. In camp situations, it can improve household nutrition and provide work for the people in the camps. Land tenure, both in urban and camp settings may become an issue.

OFDA supports urban agricultural programs because of the increased urbanization and vulnerability of the urban poor. In addition to reducing the vulnerability of the poor, urban agriculture can also be incorporated into urban planning to stabilize hillsides, provide firewood (agroforestry), and feed small urban livestock. Ms Powers indicated that when responding to disasters it was important to link mitigation and preparedness activities in settlements. Settlements are multi-sectoral by definition and should be part of the larger development process. Ms Powers cited the example of Sierra Leone where livelihood and shelter programs were linked, as nurseries planted fast growing leguminous trees to replace trees cut down by IDPs in camps.

- **Marion Pratt, OFDA/TAG**

Time, culture and environment play important parts in peoples' sense of place (location) around the world. When people are forced to leave their homes during disasters it affects their resettlements abilities. If changes are too rapid or too deep they overwhelm people's abilities to adapt to their new location. Ms Pratt cited several current examples to illustrate the difficulties of humanitarian work around the world. In Kenya the scarcity of land pitted farmers against herders over access and user rights to land. Land reclamation issues have risen following the Nyiragongo Volcano eruption in the Democratic Republic of Congo, in January 2002. Inhabitants in the heart of Goma may never be able to return to their original homes because they were covered by lava. In Uganda, people have been using mosquito nets for wedding dresses.

- **Jim Smith, OFDA/TAG**

Natural disasters are not always isolated events. Many natural disasters reoccur at more or less expected intervals. Following an earthquake, the question most posed is when will the next one occur. What we really should be asking is: if shelters are rebuilt in the same fashion as before the earthquake, how long will it take for the replaced shelter to be destroyed in the next earthquake. In the last 20 years 16 earthquakes have rocked Afghanistan. In Afghanistan, OFDA housing grants now include elements incorporating

greater seismic resistance. Mr. Smith stated that volcano eruptions are slow onset disasters, and there is generally enough time to develop a volcano emergency plan and set-up monitoring that can forecast when the volcano might erupt.

One natural disaster may set up populations for potential harm from other types of natural disasters. Mr. Smith stated that landslides commonly accompany earthquakes. These landslides may fill and choke streams, making the area vulnerable to future flooding. Droughts may kill vegetation and plants on hillsides changing soils so that they do not soak up rain. When the drought ends, rain rapidly runs off denuded slopes, causing flooding and sediment deposition along streams. If people resettle along stream banks they will be vulnerable to other potential disasters.

Mr. Smith also presented a short summary on settlements. Five global trends affect settlements and shelter: rapid population growth, rapid urban growth, widespread and growing poverty, environmental degradation and increasing conflicts/natural disasters. In developing countries, these trends converge to increase the vulnerability of millions of people to disaster. Settlements programming seeks to integrate a range of sectoral activities in physical locations to approximate the integrated and multi-faceted nature of settlements, and the need to draw development issues such as governance and accountability more fully into post-emergency responses, thereby promoting the larger objective of development relief.

Shelter generates more livelihood opportunities than any other economic activity. Usually we can count a 2.5 multiplier for each house created. Ways to maximize livelihood generation is by focusing on lower cost housing, utilizing local materials and labor; and, promoting home-based enterprises.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** Future conflicts will be over natural resources. Is USAID going to attempt to mitigate this and integrate it in its programs?

**A:** The conflict office is still in the organizational stage. Two years ago there was a conference on environmental issues. It reported that past conflicts over water issues, never led to bloodshed.

**Q:** Short-term effects of urban farming are understandable. Where would it be sustainable in the long-term?

**A:** It depends on where it is carried out. It would not be sustainable in camp situations. In cities such as Lima or Jakarta, you need local government support and extension services support.

**Q:** Urban agriculture will not make up for the food security needs in cities. If the food supply is cut off, urban agriculture will not be able to supply cities. Can you comment?

**A:** This is true in rural areas as well. If food aid is cut off, there will not be enough food. However, urban agriculture provides for the needed diversification of diet and for cash generation.

**Q:** To what extent do we have urban planning in settlements now?

**A:** We include seismic building in Afghanistan for stronger resistance to lower magnitude earthquake. It is an economic driver. It is done in Kinshasa on the outskirts of town. In Mali, by encouraging trash removal in areas that were prone to flooding and where trash blocked drainage areas, trash collectors found an income generating activity.

## **8. Humanitarian Information Centers**

**Facilitator:** Rhonda Davis, OFDA/Geographic Information Unit

**Presenters:** Joe Donahue, Vietnam Veterans of America/Information and Mine Action Programs (VVAF/iMAP)  
Pablo Recalde, UN OCHA/Field Information Support Unit

Ms Davis introduced the session by stating that its purpose was to explain the concept of Humanitarian Information Centers (HIC) and to get feedback from the audience on their experience working with these centers in the field. Mr. Recalde provided a short presentation on the establishment and goals of an HIC, while Mr. Donahue provided a case study of the HIC in Afghanistan. After the panel presentations, the audience was divided into three breakout groups with specific HIC-related issues to discuss and then report out their conclusions.

- **Pablo Recalde, UN OCHA/Field Information Support Unit**

Mr. Recalde spoke about the critical role of data collection, management, and sharing of emergency preparedness and response. This collaboration is especially crucial in the early stages of a disaster response because no single entity holds all of the data necessary to make the most informed decisions. Shared data can be linked together to plan coordinated field response operations or as a database to be used to create maps, reports and other derived products. A system of place-codes (P-Codes) is being developed to facilitate cross-sector analysis of information. HICs also help coordinate joint rapid assessment forms as well as develop databases of who is doing what where. These products are utilized to perform triage and target the most affected areas by determining where internally displaced persons are located, where more in-depth needs assessments are required, to provide security updates, and help limit duplication and gaps in response efforts.

- **Joe Donahue, VVAF**

Mr. Donahue stated that his initial contact with an HIC was through his efforts to bring landmine awareness issues to a wider audience in Afghanistan. He noted that the main challenge to the success of the Afghanistan HIC (Afghanistan Information Management Services, or AIMS) was to get relief organizations and other users to think of the center as a means for supporting the overall relief operation rather than being perceived as a United Nations information and transaction office. The Afghanistan HIC has been successful in building significant goodwill and understanding among its users and

providing information on health, education, water/sanitation, infrastructure, agriculture, and food security issues. Maintaining strong donor interest throughout the transition of HICs and overcoming the problems of maintaining sufficient levels of administrative support will be important to the success of future HICs.

### Questions and Answers

**Q:** Why are HICs needed? Why not rely on the news media?

**A:** An HIC is needed to assist in planning an appropriate overall international response by assessing what and where are the humanitarian needs. Unlike the news media, the HIC has better access to the NGO community, better data management, and the best field information to analyze.

**Q:** Who funds the HICs?

**A:** Donors to the HICs include OFDA, DFID, ECHO, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, U.S. Department of State, and private sector contributors. HIC personnel are also being provided by contributions from donors.



*The Humanitarian Information Center Panel:  
(l-r) Joe Donahue, Rhonda Davis, Pablo Recalde*

**Q:** What does the future hold for HICs in disaster responses?

**A:** HICs will need to increase their contact with the NGO community to receive primary data and to disseminate the compiled data for use by the NGOs participating in a disaster response. HICs must be a broad body under the guidance of the humanitarian coordinator leading the response. Humanitarian responses often continue after the news media loses interest and HICs remain important for disseminating updated information. In order to maintain this role, the responsibility for maintaining a HIC could be turned over to an NGO or the national government in the affected country.

**Q:** How much leadership should an HIC promote in directing the information provided?

**A:** In Afghanistan, cooperation by NGOs varies depending on location. The HIC wants to engage NGOs on minimum standards for reporting at the country or provincial levels. This is one of the main challenges facing future HICs. Training sessions for NGOs are being discussed with InterAction representatives to promote information exchange and the type of information that needs to be provided. There are so many diverse organizations in Afghanistan, it is difficult to get an agreement on collecting and sharing information. A solution may be to ask U.N. officials to create develop commonly agreed-upon procedures with NGOs to use common data collection formats before they enter a humanitarian emergency.

Following the above presentation, participants broke out into two groups to discuss three topics, and came back together to share their responses. On the following page is a summary of the discussions.

## **1. What does my organization need or want from an HIC?**

- It is important to remember that information needs and requirements change over time. During the first weeks of an emergency, the needs are for population data and rough assessments. After a month or so, NGOs will need more sophisticated analysis of data.
- Rapid assessment forms were very popular in Kosovo (HCIC). The forms allow NGOs to get moving and working quickly from a common baseline of analyzed information.
- A virtual HIC (an unofficial HIC assembled before an impending disaster) may be useful. NGOs could be consulted and therefore help improve the services of an HIC before an emergency response commences.
- Hazard and threat information. Information regarding local crime, unexploded ordnances (UXO), landmines, checkpoints, etc. could inform NGOs in their decision-making to send personnel to the field.
- Information on who is doing what where is helpful for NGOs and other responders to better coordinate their activities.
- Briefing packet or guidance. Some documents that inform them of the aspects of their response that are unique and/or important information. For example, a British organization put together a basic information booklet for Afghanistan that was very popular and informative.
- Local resource inventories would allow NGOs to quickly find needed relief commodities on the local market. This should also prevent some new NGOs from getting overcharged for their procurements.
- Knowledge sharing and learning from experience. What has been done, what worked, what didn't and assessment results from past humanitarian responses?
- High quality control provides quality information management services of all data. Determines the accuracy, reliability and confidence levels of collected data.
- Institutional knowledge. Disaster responses are plagued with high relief personnel turnover rates. The HIC should consider itself a key component in maintaining a continuity of knowledge within the international humanitarian community. A strong HIC will minimize the re-learning of response lessons through trial and error.

## **2. What can your organization provide to a HIC?**

- The issue of data is related to the stage of emergency response. In the initial stages of a response, NGOs will be the best organizations to provide population figures at a very disaggregated level. In later stages of a humanitarian emergency, NGOs can provide more specific or sectoral data.
- HICs should be ready to accept all types of data from anyone. For example, an NGO doing a sanitation survey can incidentally come across a collapsed bridge. The HIC should be receptive to this type of miscellaneous but important information.
- NGOs operating in a specific town or village can report on the availability of basic products (food, fuels, electricity, etc.), or indicators of a return to normalcy, such as bakeries reopening. This could be a standard form issued by an HIC.
- NGOs can provide the price of basic services (drivers, security, etc). By collecting this info the HIC can provide an important service to newly arrived humanitarian workers.
- HICs could coordinate, with input from the NGOs the existence of surplus or deficit of supplies. (i.e. medical supplies)

## **3. What constraints are keeping your organization from sharing? What can be done to make things easier?**

- Training is crucial. To ensure buy-in and correct utilization of standard assessment forms, the HICs must “de-mystify” their products; for example, “P-Codes” need to be defined and their value explained. Advocacy from higher authorities can help alleviate this problem.
- HICs should be ready to train local staff. Language barriers could be a constraint.
- Data sharing can sometimes be problematic, due to real and perceived issues related to security, confidentiality of contacts, funding, etc.
- The way that HICs operate is not traditional so it often takes people time before they see the benefit to an information management structure.



## **9. Disaster Mitigation and Prevention**

**Facilitator:** Harry Proctor, OFDA, Technical Assistance Group  
**Presenters:** Vernon Kousky, NOAA, Climate Prediction Center (CPC)  
William Whelan, USAID, Office of Food for Peace (FFP)  
Kelly Sponberg, NOAA, Office of Global Programs (OGP)  
Charles Kelly, CARE

Mr. Proctor introduced the presenters and provided a brief introduction on the role, organization, and activities of the Technical Assistance Group (TAG).

- **Harry Proctor, OFDA/TAG**

The TAG has a global and multi-sectoral mandate to provide scientific, technical, and analytical knowledge and skills to OFDA's actions and decision-making processes in order to achieve OFDA's mission more effectively and efficiently. These mitigation activities involve agriculture, shelter, hydrometeorological events, water and sanitation, health, and geohazards. The TAG falls under OFDA's Disaster Response and Mitigation Division and is divided into teams covering Natural Environments, Public Health, and Agricultural/Food Security. Examples of current projects include drought and flood monitoring in Africa, research on disease vectors in complex emergencies, and bio-control of pests. The TAG works with NGOs, the U.S. Government, IOs, academic institutions, and the private sector in order to meet OFDA's goals.

- **Dr. Vernon Kousky, NOAA/CPC**

Dr. Kousky discussed El Nino's recent evolution, current status, and predictions about its impact, duration, and severity.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) defines El Nino as "sea surface temperatures 0.5°C above average." By this definition, El Nino conditions commenced during April-June 2002. A transition from La Nina to a developing warm-episode (El Nino) began in mid-2001, and an evolution toward a Pacific basin-wide El Nino began during early 2002. A number of predictions about the current El Nino can be made based on recent and current conditions, statistics, and coupled model forecasts. The current El Nino episode should continue through the northern winter 2002-2003 and into the spring 2003. This El Nino will be weaker than the 1997-98 El Nino. In comparison with previous events, the current El Nino is of average severity. Typically, El Nino will cause Indonesia, northeast Brazil, Central America/Mexico, and southeast Africa to be dryer than normal during all or part of the event. Wetter than normal conditions tend to be observed during December, January and February along coastal Ecuador, northwestern Peru, southern Brazil, central Argentina, and during June, July and August in the intermountain regions of the United States and over central Chile.

- **Dr. William Whelan, USAID/FFP**

Dr. Whelan discussed the Famine Early Warning System Network (FEWS NET).

The Famine Early Warning System Network (FEWS NET) enables better prediction of famines and the factors that lead to them, better actions to prevent them, and better responses to food insecurity. Regionally, activities are focused on Africa, Central America, and Central Asia. FEWS NET partners include regional organizations as well as NOAA, NASA, and USGS's Eros Data Center, and Chemonics International. FEWS NET's strategy is to build, strengthen, and collaborate with national and regional assessment capabilities. It possesses broad assessment capabilities to perform baseline analyses, hazard early warning, food availability early warning, food access early warning, food aid targeting, and famine early warning. A permanent field presence and relationships with decision-makers allow FEWS NET to help build an early consensus about the magnitude of a problem and an appropriate response. A base in Washington permits FEWS NET to analyze, inform, and present the basis of USAID/FFP actions that impact OFDA as well.

- **Kelly Sponberg, NOAA/OGP**

Mr. Sponberg discussed RANET's goals, objectives, and current activities.

Radio and Internet for the Communications of Hydro-Meteorological and Climate Related Information (RANET) is a cooperative effort to improve overall access to climate and weather observations, products, and training. RANET's membership includes National Hydro-Meteorological Services (NHMSs), NGOs, and international agencies. RANET reduces vulnerability to weather-related disasters by helping ensure rural and resource poor communities have access to weather forecasts and information and improving the ability of meteorological services to disseminate their own content. Current activities involve information access, training (country training, printed material, and NGO collaboration), network development, and satellite broadcast management and operations. The program currently operates in Africa and is exploring appropriate roles in Asia and the Pacific.

- **Charles Kelly, CARE**

Mr. Kelly discussed the importance of environmental considerations in disaster relief and steps that CARE has taken and will be taking to address these problems.

Environmental considerations present a number of problems for disaster recovery. Disasters contribute to and result in environmental problems. Relief aid also has both positive and negative environmental impacts. Finally, there is also no systematic way to incorporate environmental impact assessment into disaster management. In response to these problems, a methodology was developed for rapid identification of environmental issues during disaster assessment, planning and operations. With input from a group of disaster and environmental specialists, the Guidelines for Rapid Environmental Impact

Assessment were developed for any type of disaster. Efforts are now focused on positioning this publication as the “best practice” in disaster management. Completing a final field test, developing training modules, holding validation training events, and disseminating training modules will accomplish this. These activities should be finished by the end of 2003.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** Does OFDA funding have to pass through a clearance process?

**A:** Yes it does. However, OFDA sometimes uses the Notwithstanding Clause in order to respond quickly to disasters. Use of the Notwithstanding Clause must be justified.

Regardless of whether or not it is used, OFDA strives to follow best practices.

**Q:** How much information dissemination does OFDA perform?

**A:** OFDA utilizes the latest technology, including the Internet, e-mail, and satellites, to disseminate information to governmental organizations, NGOs, and its partners.

**Q:** Will the intensity of disasters increase as a result of climate change?

**A:** Climate change is not expected to increase the intensity of disasters in the near future.

**Q:** What can be done to prepare for climate change?

**A:** Humanitarian assistance organizations need to identify the economic and social resilience of the local population to climate change. In this regard, it is also important to work with and elicit inputs from affected populations on their needs and possible solutions.

**Q:** What is OFDA doing to prepare/mitigate the effects of El Nino in South America?

**A:** OFDA disseminates warnings for the drought and supports regional programs that work with local partners on agriculture and livestock issues.



*Peter Morris presents during the Disaster Mitigation and Prevention session as panel members (l-r) Charles Kelly, Dr. William Whelan, Kelly Sponberg, and Dr. Vernon Kousky look on*

## **10. Meeting the Needs of IDPs: An Assessment of Progress to Date**

**Facilitator:** Dina Esposito, Independent Consultant

**Presenters:** Marc Vincent, UN OCHA

Joel Charny, Refugees International

Anita Menghetti, NGO/IO Donor Coordinator, OFDA

Ms Esposito opened the panel by stating that there is an increase in IDPs worldwide and the policies governing IDPs have changed since the U.N.'s 1999 policy paper and its 2000 IDP guidelines. Ms Esposito said Mr. Vincent would discuss UN OCHA's IDP unit that was created this year; Mr. Charny would provide the NGO perspective on IDPs; and Ms Menghetti would explain the USAID/DCHA and State/PRM IDP guidelines.

- **Marc Vincent: UN OCHA's IDP Unit**

Mr. Vincent described the impetus for UN OCHA's creation of an IDP unit and explained its work to date. Mr. Vincent said that Richard Holbrooke's visit to Angola encouraged the establishment of an IDP unit because he found that the needs of IDPs were going unmet, but UNHCR was meeting the needs of refugees. The U.N. responded by creating a senior network and visited countries to see how to improve the U.N.'s response for IDPs. The group recommended the funding of an IDP unit within UN OCHA, to be made up with succundees from various U.N. offices. The unit was established on January 1, 2002, and both the U.N. and the NGOs had large expectations for the office. The unit had a budget of approximately \$2.5 million this year and a staff of nine in Geneva.

The unit's strategy focused on four areas: 1) field support, 2) protection, 3) capacity building, and 4) advocacy. The unit visited 14 displacement situations and provided technical assistance or advice. Mr. Vincent said the unit's visits were reactive rather than strategic. To address protection, the unit formed a protection coalition made up of different U.N. organizations. The coalition first worked on Liberia and looked at registration and camp management, and then decided how to delegate work between the different organizations. The unit held eight training workshops since its inception and has trained 200 people, which it plans to continue next year. In addition, the unit plans on sending out a protection survey in order to design a protection template. Mr. Vincent concluded by saying that the unit may not have met all of its expectations, but he believed that its credibility is growing and this will allow it to make stronger recommendations and be held accountable in the future.

- **Joel Charny: NGO Perspective on IDPs**

Mr. Charny explained that Refugees International wants to see an overall improvement in humanitarian responses through structural changes. He said there is a need to focus not just on IDPs, but how to get humanitarian access to meet people's needs. Mr. Charny described a few recent examples to illustrate his point. Refugees International sent a team to Sierra Leone in April 2002 and found there was a difference in the treatment of

IDPs and refugees. UNHCR effectively organized the needs of refugees, but 30 different organizations were in charge of IDP needs and still basic needs were not being addressed. Mr. Charny said this experience raised the point of the need for one coordinating agency for IDPs. In Angola in June, the organization found that the international community was not prepared when IDPs were ready to return home. This incident showed the need for contingency plans. Refugees International completed an assessment in Uganda in October, and the visit confirmed the need for political pressure to get governments to respond effectively.

Mr. Charny said it was not feasible to create a dedicated IDP agency due to funding reasons. However, he said that there should be a lead agency in each country and it should be whichever agency is the most appropriate for the particular country. UNHCR does not always need to be the lead agency despite its capacity and protection coverage. In terms of protection, ICRC is the lead agency, and should be included on IDP issues. Mr. Charny asked for clarification on the USG's approach to IDPs in terms of funding and the operational differences between OFDA and PRM.

- **Anita Menghetti: The USG and IDPs**

Ms Menghetti explained that policies based on legislation dictate the USG's response to IDP situations. The legislation stipulates that OFDA responds to disasters, while PRM has a refugee protection mandate that also dictates the agencies its funds, such as UNHCR, ICRC, IOM and UNWRA. Missions are serving IDP needs even when it is not reflected in their strategic objectives. DCHA commissioned Ms Esposito to assess what USAID is doing on the IDP issue. The preliminary results of her findings show that USAID performs better when addressing short-term IDP needs but does not do as well as on protection or long-term displacements. Ms Menghetti expects USAID to make improvements to better meet long-term displacement needs. USAID's real challenge is meeting the protection needs of IDP populations for which it has responsibility.

## **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** In the new IDP document, does it outline how funding works for PRM and DCHA?

**A:** Yes, the document which is primarily concerned with an over-arching division of labor, not just IDPs, also states that PRM and DCHA have three days to inform the other on activities that will or will not be funded.

**Q:** What is the thinking on Colombia?

**A:** Mr. Vincent answered that the country is using courageous coping mechanisms to deal with the IDP issue. However, when IDPs move to urban areas they do not want to be labeled as IDPs out of fear the rebels will target them. Mr. Vincent expects there will be changes under the new administration. Ms Esposito said the USAID Mission in Colombia has a strong field program to address IDP issues.

**Q:** How do you talk about the needs of IDPs without suggesting the creation of a new U.N. agency or creating a privileged category of vulnerables, i.e. IDPs?

**A:** Mr. Vincent answered that there is a need to clearly define roles on how agencies respond to the IDP issue. In addition, there is a need for a protection methodology specifically for IDPs. Also donor priorities need to be known so NGOs know how to get resources.

**Q:** What mechanisms are there within USAID to move from emergency to development in regards to IDPs? Is this currently being addressed?

**A:** Ms Esposito answered that in her past experiences with USAID, the agency was taking an integrated approach to this issue. She discovered that it was better to get all the different actors together to create an integrated approach since this helps with the transition to development. Ms Esposito said she believes that USAID is taking positive steps to allow for this transition, but she added that each country approach is different.



*Mark Vincent, Dana Esposito and Joel Charney discuss “Meeting the Needs of IDPs”*

## **DCHA PANEL**

**Facilitator:** Bear McConnell, DCHA/OFDA

**Presenters:** Roger Winter, DCHA

**Leonard Rogers, DCHA/ Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation**

**David Taylor, DCHA/Office of Transition Initiatives**

**Lauren Landis, DCHA/Office of Food for Peace**

**Judith Gilmore, DCHA/Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation**

**Gail Leece, DCHA/Democracy and Governance**

Mr. McConnell provided a short introduction to the bureaus and introduced Roger Winter, the Assistant Administrator of the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance.

- **Roger Winter, DCHA Bureau**

Mr. Winter explained that USAID Administrator Andrew Natsios reorganized USAID to restore it as a respected component of the U.S. Government's (USG) foreign policy. USAID has been restructured into regional bureaus and pillar bureaus, and DCHA is one of three pillar bureaus. The pillar bureaus are field support oriented, have extensive technical expertise, and assist USAID Missions and the Regional Bureaus with their programs. However, DCHA does manage many of its programs directly, and Mr. Winter said it is known for its professionalism and good programming. DCHA has a \$2 billion budget and eight offices. The Offices of Democracy and Governance and Conflict Management and Mitigation were added as part of the reorganization that was just approved two months ago. Administrator Natsios has asked DCHA to view all of its programs through a "failed states" prism since most DCHA responses, outside of natural disasters, have been the result of an active conflict or a breakdown in the state apparatus. DCHA also has a special focus on IDPs. Mr. Winter believes that it is the responsibility of USAID to be the focal point for the IDP issue in the USG.

- **Leonard Rogers, Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation**

Mr. Rogers explained the impetus for creating the Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation (CMM). CMM, which still does not have a director or budget, was created because USAID Administrator Natsios recognized the important changes going in the world, such as a rise in failed states, poverty, HIV/AIDS, food insecurity, and a backward slide in the number of democracies. CMM was established to address these issues, with its first goal being mitigation and its second being conflict prevention. The Administrator wanted to differentiate CMM from OTI, so it was established as a field support office, like Democracy and Governance. CMM is expected to have a \$50 million budget once it is operational. It will be a small office with four direct hire and six personal service contractor positions. The office has begun work on its strategy and has been in consultations with private voluntary organizations since CMM will work closely with them.

- **David Taylor, Office of Transition Initiatives**

Mr. Taylor discussed the historical genesis of the Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI) and its future. OTI was established in 1994 to focus on operational responses, work at the grassroots levels, and provide leadership with “transition dividends.” Mr. Taylor explained how OTI has worked to balance the need to respond quickly but also be a team player. On average, OTI works in ten countries per year, but 2001 was the office’s most active year. Mr. Taylor said that rules of engagement are clear but the rules of disengagement are not. Congress believes that OTI’s presence in a country should range from 18 to 24 months; thus, OTI is currently developing rules of disengagement. Mr. Taylor shared OTI’s experience from its six-year involvement in East Timor resulting in the following prescription for success: 1) the right people who are willing to take risks (innovative thinking); 2) broad strategic objectives; 3) flexible implementation mechanisms; and 4) financial resources.

- **Lauren Landis, Office of Food for Peace**

Ms Landis provided an overview of the Office of Food for Peace (FFP) and explained three challenges that the office currently faces. FFP, with its worldwide mandate to provide emergency and development food aid and food security, implements its programs primarily through NGOs and the U.N. World Food Program (WFP). FFP operates with an annual budget of approximately \$1 billion that comes from U.S. agricultural appropriations. In 2001, FFP spent approximately \$600 million on emergency food aid, including the response for Afghanistan. In addition, the USG, primarily through Title II money, annually funds about 50 to 60 percent of WFP’s emergency budget. FFP provides a combination of U.S. grown food and cash resources to its programs. Emergency grants are generally one-year long, and development cooperative agreements run for five years. Ms Landis highlighted the three challenges facing FFP: 1) a worldwide decline in resources for food aid and food security when large-scale food crises are occurring; 2) the Continuing Resolution that has restricted FFP’s financial resources when there are more emergencies and higher food prices; and 3) how to prevent famines from occurring by making FFP fast in its response and better analyzing food insecurity. In order to help FFP meet these challenges, the office has been restructured to include a new technical policy unit, and the Famine Early Warning Systems Network has been moved to FFP in the hopes of making it worldwide.

*Lauren Landis discusses FFP issues as Len Rogers (l) and David Taylor, Director of the Office of Transition Initiatives look on*





- **Judith Gilmore, Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation**

Ms Gilmore described the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation (PVC) and its new strategy. PVC is the central point for private voluntary organizations' (PVOs) partnership with USAID. PVC registers PVOs, hosts the Advisory Committee on Foreign Aid, manages grant programs, and has a mandate to build the capacity of U.S. PVOs. Through consultation meetings, PVC has discovered five key issues that its new strategy aims to address: 1) build the capacity of local NGOs since civil society has changed the development landscape; 2) help PVOs that are refocusing their efforts on facilitating local NGOs; 3) partner with the private sector and not rely solely on donors; 4) advocate for policy reform; and 5) link conflict prevention and mitigation with development.

- **Gail Leece, Office of Democracy and Governance**

Ms Leece explained how one of the newest members of the DCHA Bureau, the Office of Democracy and Governance (DG), is linked to OFDA. Ms Leece said there are two different ways to view the relationship between the two offices. One is the macro view that shows the importance of democracy for preventing disasters and also how governance problems can cause or exacerbate the impact of disasters. This is one of the reasons why DG exists to strengthen democracy and governance through its programs that focus on the rule of law, civil society, media, the legislature, and local governments. In addition, DG has programs that address corruption issues since corruption can also exacerbate or lead to disasters. DG has made it a top priority to improve its anti-corruption programs, and the office is developing a new, comprehensive strategy on anti-corruption for USAID. The other optic to view the relationship between DG and OFDA is through how DG's democracy programs relate to disaster assistance since a major disaster will usually change the dynamics of governance in a country. Ms Leece provided examples of how the Honduran government managed Hurricane Mitch and the affects of the disaster on Honduran governance.



***DCHA Office Directors l-r: Lauren Landis (Food for Peace), Judith Gilmore (Private and Voluntary Cooperation), Gail Leece (Democracy and Governance), and Bear McConnell (OFDA)***

## **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** Can you provide examples of interweaving in the Bureau?

**A:** Mr. Winter answered that USAID has learned from its experience in Burundi to not just focus on one aspect of an emergency. Now, DCHA draws upon five or six different offices to respond to a disaster and discusses how to pull resources together.

**Q:** How is DG working to improve monitoring and protection of IDPs?

**A:** The issue of protection is an area that not only USAID needs to be involved. Other organizations, such as the National Security Council and the local police, need to be involved.

**Q:** How is DCHA working to address individual security and terrorism?

**A:** It is the mission of DCHA to deal with the humanitarian consequences of the war on terrorism and the possible war in Iraq.

**Q:** Which countries will CMM work with? How can NGOs work with the office?

**A:** Mr. Rogers answered that nonpresence countries, such as Somalia, are of interest. However, the office will decide on its country priorities with the Missions. If NGOs are interested in working with CMM, they can contact the local Mission since CMM will allocate its resources to Missions.

**Q:** How is DCHA reconciling the political offices of the Bureau due to the need to distance politics from saving lives?

**A:** Mr. Winter answered that USAID cannot separate humanitarian and political issues, especially for failed states. For example, the humanitarian response for Sudan focused on areas outside the control of the government.

## DONOR PANEL DISCUSSION

**Facilitator:** Bear McConnell, OFDA

**Presenters:** Arthur Dewey, U.S. Department of State, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM)  
Stephen McClelland, DFID/CHAD  
Geert Heikens, Counselor, Economic, Financial and Development Affairs, Delegation of the European Commission

Mr. McConnell introduced the panelists.

- **Arthur Dewey, State/PRM**

Mr. Dewey explained how the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM) is working with USAID on protection for IDPs. PRM is addressing both the legal and physical issues of protection and also due to the sexual exploitation scandal in West Africa and Nepal, is working on protection for NGOs both from within and without for international staff. The Bureau is developing a code of conduct, which joins both assistance and protection. Mr. Dewey stated that refugee money should go to refugee organizations with a protection mandate. NGOs have a role to protect, but they also need protection from international organizations. As a result, most of PRM's money goes to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). PRM does provide some money to NGOs to supplement UNHCR activities, but it insists on a code of conduct and requires NGOs to work under the lead of UNHCR. Mr. Dewey said the experience in Afghanistan is a good example of how programs can work in the future since there was an orderly process unlike what happened in Albania. However, there is still a concern about coordination since the center of gravity for U.S. humanitarian action for victims of man-made emergencies rests in the multilateral system. Mr. Dewey stressed that the bulk of humanitarian action will be multilateral if needed for Iraq. As PRM faces financial constraints and the number of crises grow, there is an increased need for burden sharing. Mr. Dewey acknowledged NGO efforts to lobby Congress for a larger budget for PRM.

- **Stephen McClelland, Department for International Development**

Mr. McClelland outlined the relationship between the UK's Department for International Development (DFID) and the Ministry of Defense. Since the Balkans, Sierra Leone and Afghanistan crises, the relationship between the two agencies has become easier due to DFID's lead role and the military's support function. Mr. McClelland said that those with experience are best suited to deliver humanitarian assistance and that DFID should only turn to the military when there is a need. DFID and the Ministry of Defense work together in four different situations: 1) natural disaster response; 2) complex emergency response; 3) peace and rehabilitation; and 4) security sector reform. For complex emergencies, when the military is involved, someone from DFID is deployed with the commander of the military. The military can fund some of its own programs, but the activities need to adhere to DFID rules. Mr. McClelland explained that some see this as military encroachment, but he said this is not the case since DFID is drawing upon the

military's strength. DFID is working with the military to overcome cultural differences through military/NGO conflict groups. In addition, the conflict prevention pool that brings together DFID, the Foreign Office, and the Ministry of Defense to address complex emergencies with financial backup, has helped improve relations.

- **Geert Heikens, Delegation of the European Commission**

Mr. Heikens provided an overview of the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid Office's (ECHO) objectives and activities. ECHO's six objectives are: 1) to provide assistance to victims of crises outside of the European Union (EU); 2) to save and preserve lives during and after emergencies; 3) to provide relief to longer-lasting crises; 4) to protect victims from civil conflict; 5) to provide short-term rehabilitation and reconstruction; and 6) to ensure preparedness for natural disasters. For humanitarian assistance, excluding food aid, EU member states provide approximately \$1.4 billion and ECHO provides an additional \$500 million. ECHO is not an implementing agency but channels its fund through the U.N. (27 percent), NGOs (64 percent), and other organizations, such as the Red Cross (nine percent). The office has a new system where aid, up to \$3 million, can be distributed within 48 hours. Approximately 160 people work in the main office in Brussels, but there are 35 offices worldwide. ECHO's strengths are its quick response to situations, strong field presence, and its attention to forgotten crises. Mr. Heikens said ECHO's priorities are the Horn of Africa, Afghanistan, forgotten crises, gender issues, improve coordination with key players, and focus on security.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q:** Can you explain the integration of foreign policy and humanitarian interests in the European context?

**A:** Mr. McClelland answered that the U.K. government's interests, which include humanitarian values, drive DFID. As a result, DFID does not see a contradiction between pursuing those values and the government's foreign policy. However, there are areas of gray, but the experimental pool of ministries allows for the development of integrated strategies to combat conflicts. Mr. Heikens replied that humanitarian aid is separate from the European Commission's foreign policy. Foreign policy is an intergovernmental effort, but ECHO is a supranational institution.

**Q:** How much of ECHO's budget is spent on forgotten crises?

**A:** Mr. Heikens responded that ECHO has allocated funding for 3 major forgotten crises in their 2002 strategy: Russia/Chechnya 25 million euro, Western Sahara 14.3 million euro, Angola 12 million euro (plus part of the 30 million euro for the food crisis in Southern Africa). This corresponds to approximately 10 percent of their 528 million euro budget for 2002. If you count the "borderline" cases in 2002 such as Uganda, Tanzania, Burundi, the percentage rises to more than 20 percent of ECHO's budget.

**Q:** Is there a link between short and long-term development initiatives in your activities?

**A:** Mr. McClelland and Mr. Heikens both said they are working on this issue but had not found a solution.

**Q:** How would you advise U.S. NGOs on how to best lobby ECHO?

**A:** Mr. Heikens answered that ECHO wants to change its structure to allow more U.S. NGOs, above the five currently qualified, to work with the office. However, contracts are usually with European organizations and implementation is carried out by U.S. NGOs. Mr. Heikens said lawyers are hampering structural changes.

**Q:** How are you dealing with the forgotten crisis of Uganda where there is a need for protection of 500,000 IDPs?

**A:** Mr. Dewey answered that more work needs to be done to address the situation in Uganda. Mr. McClelland said DFID's Secretary of State is alarmed by the situation. Mr. Heikens replied that member states have not conditioned aid because of the problem of how to work with the Ugandan government.

**Q:** A number of NGOs have sent a letter to European donors on the crisis in Ethiopia. Do you believe there is a valid basis for the letter? How do you respond to the letter?

**A:** Neither Mr. Heikens nor Mr. McClelland was familiar with the letter. However, Mr. Heikens said ECHO was aware of the crisis and is reacting. Mr. McClelland said DFID is currently carrying out an assessment in Ethiopia and it will have a coordinated response. However, he expressed less concern over Ethiopia since the country has internal mechanisms to deal with the situations and said that crisis does not appear to be at the same stage as the food crisis in Southern Africa.



*Geert Heikens, ECHO (left) and Stephen McClelland, DFID (right) speak during the Donor Panel Discussion*

**USAID/DCHA/OFDA – 21<sup>st</sup> Biennial NGO Conference 2002**  
**21-22 November 2002**  
**"Humanitarian Action in an Increasingly Complex World"**  
**List of Speakers, Facilitators and Reporters**

**Rob Andrew** currently serves as Program Officer for the Europe, Middle East and Central Asia Team (EMCA), with the Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA), with specific regional responsibility for Afghanistan and the Central Asian Republics. During this period he has served on Disaster Assistance Response Teams (DART) to Uzbekistan and Afghanistan. Prior to his current position with OFDA he held the position of Regional Head of Office/Human Rights Officer with the Office for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and positions as Country Director with the International Rescue Committee (IRC) in Sudan, Tajikistan and Croatia. He was also a Peace Corps volunteer in Kenya.

**Jock M. Baker** is a Senior Adviser for Assessment, Design, Monitoring & Evaluation in the Emergency and Humanitarian Assistance Unit at CARE-USA and is also CARE International's focal point for evaluations of emergencies. He worked as a consultant for two years before joining CARE at the end of 2001 following sixteen years as UN staff with UNHCR, WFP, UNDP and OCHA. His overseas assignments have included the Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Indonesia, Former Republic of Yugoslavia, Myanmar, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, the Philippines, Senegal, and Sri Lanka. Apart from his role as Project Manager of the REA Project for CARE-USA, Mr. Baker provides technical support to CARE Country Offices and is currently involved in another initiative to develop capacity of CARE and its partners to work in transition and conflict-affected environments.

**William E. Barron** is the Planning and Logistics Consultant for the VVAF's Survey Action Center (SAC) and an environmental engineer with extensive experience planning and managing development and environmentally oriented projects. Mr. Barron is responsible for planning and monitoring the conduct of landmine level one surveys. From 1990 to 1997, he was a Program Officer for the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in Pakistan. In this capacity he planned, supervised, and evaluated programs of water supply, health, education for Afghan refugees in Pakistan, and voluntary repatriation to Afghanistan; assisting a caseload of up to 2.0 million Afghan refugees in Pakistan. From 1988 to 1990, Mr. Barron was the Rural Water Advisor/ Engineer for OXFAM based in Phnom Penh, Cambodia. From 1985 to 1987 Mr. Barron was an Environmental Engineer for the CARE-Haiti Community Water Systems and Sanitation Development Project. Mr. Barron has a Master of Science Degree in Environmental Engineering, with a focus on International Water Supply and Sanitation from the School of Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He received his undergraduate training in Civil Engineering from Vanderbilt University.

**Aldo Benini** is the Social Scientist Consultant for VVAF's Survey Action Center (SAC). As the SAC Social Scientist he is responsible for developing the protocols and instrument

for Level One Impact Surveys. From 1995 to 1998, Dr. Benini was a visiting research scientist at California Polytechnic State University, where he conducted courses on ethnic relations in world perspective and worked on projects of computer simulation for relief agencies. In addition he completed short missions for the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, ICRC and the Swiss Red Cross in Sudan, Bosnia, Germany, Afghanistan and Bangladesh. From 1987 to 1994, Dr. Benini had various responsibilities for the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). From 1983 to 1986, Dr. Benini was the Program Coordinator for a Lutheran World Federation rural development program in Bangladesh. From 1979 to 1983, he was the Sector Head for South Asia and the Middle East for the Protestant Association for Cooperation in Development. Dr. Benini received his doctorate in Social Sciences from the University of Bielefeld in Germany.

**James Keough Bishop** has been the Director for Humanitarian Response at InterAction since 1995. Bishop works with the members of the 160-agency NGO coalition on disaster response abroad. He also is a member of the management committees of InterAction and of the Sphere Project. He works closely with the U.S. government and with United Nations agencies on humanitarian issues. A retired U.S. Foreign Service Officer, he served as U.S. Ambassador to Somalia, Liberia and Niger, and as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Africa and for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs.

**Ambassador Wendy Chamberlin** is the Assistant Administrator for the Africa and Near East (ANE) Bureau within USAID. Prior to her current assignment she served as the U.S. Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan until June 2002. Before that she was the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary in the Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL) at the Department of State. Throughout her 27-year career as a Foreign Service Officer she worked extensively on Near East, East Asian and South Asian affairs. She worked on foreign aid accounts as the political military officer for Israel and Arab-Israeli Affairs and Acting Director of the Regional Affairs Office in the Near East Bureau during the 1980's. Ambassador Chamberlin worked closely with USAID colleagues in her overseas postings in Zaire (Congo), Laos, Malaysia, Morocco, and Pakistan. Prior to joining the Foreign Service in 1975 she was a volunteer teacher at the Lao National Teacher Training College for the International Voluntary Service. She is fluent in Lao and French.

**Joel R. Charny** is Vice President for Policy of Refugees International. He is responsible for overseeing the policy and advocacy program of the organization. Mr. Charny assumed this position in July 2000 after working for four years in Cambodia as Deputy Program Manager with the CARERE project of the United Nations Development Program. Prior to working for the UNDP in Cambodia, Mr. Charny spent sixteen years with Oxfam America, based in Boston. He first worked inside Cambodia during the famine emergency there in 1980 and went on to manage the agency's work in Southeast Asia and the wider Asia region. In 1989 he became Overseas Director and in 1994 Policy Director. Mr. Charny is the author of *Obstacles to Recovery in Vietnam and Kampuchea: U.S. Embargo of Humanitarian Aid*. He is the author of articles published by Kumerian Press, the Brookings Institution, *The New York Times*, *The Los Angeles Times*,

*Asiaweek*, *The Asian Wall Street Journal*, and *The Christian Science Monitor*. He has a Masters in international education from the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

**Charles Conley** is the Information Management Officer for the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation managed Survey Action Center based in Washington, DC. Mr. Conley is a geographer specializing in less developed nations economic development and geographic information systems. During 1999 Mr. Conley worked for Earth Satellite Corporation as an image processing specialist. During this time Mr. Conley was responsible for processing and analyzing a wide variety of satellite imagery for use in many diverse settings. In 1998 he worked as a development and planning assistant for Belleville, Illinois. From 1995 to 1998 Mr. Conley was employed as a GIS Research Assistant by the Geography Department of Southern Illinois University. He worked as part of team responsible for geo-rectifying and registering remotely sensed imagery and GPS elevation data for use in precision agriculture.

**Rhonda Davis** is the Geographic Information Coordinator for the USAID Office for US Foreign Disaster Assistance. Her background is in geographic information systems and location/allocation and transportation modeling as applied to international development and humanitarian response. She worked with the United Nations for over four years as a GIS Specialist with the UN Cartographic Section and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. There, she co-developed the Geographic Information Support Team (GIST), a working group of members from UN and donor organizations. She also facilitated the set up of Humanitarian Information Centers (HICs) for several crises, including: Kosovo, Sierra Leone, and Afghanistan (Islamabad). Since February, she continues to support HICs and other information management initiatives in her new role at OFDA and as a member of the GIST.

**Arthur E. "Gene" Dewey** was sworn in on January 30, 2002 as Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration. Mr. Dewey's public and private career background cuts across several practitioner disciplines: military, diplomatic, United Nations, and nongovernmental organizations. In 25 years as a military officer, his duties ranged from two Vietnam combat aviation assignments to Chief of the Army's Political-Military Division in the Pentagon. During the "Refugee Decade" of the '80s, he served for 5 years in the State Department as Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau for Refugee Programs. Subsequently, he was named a United Nations Assistant Secretary-General and served 4 years in Geneva as UN Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees. In 1993, he was selected to head the NGO successor to the former House Select Committee on Hunger -- the Congressional Hunger Center. Over the past 5 years he has worked with military theater commands in Latin America, Europe, and Asia in bringing realistic political and humanitarian dimensions into post-Cold War military training exercises. Mr. Dewey is a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point and received his Master's degree from Princeton University.

**Joe Donahue** is the Operations Officer for VVAF's Survey Action Center (SAC). As the SAC Operations Officer, Joe is responsible for planning the management and conduct of landmine Level One Impact Surveys (LOIS). Currently VVAF is actively involved in the



management and execution of surveys in Yemen, Chad, Lebanon, Thailand, and Kosovo. From 1994 until 1996 Joe served with a variety of non-government organizations (NGO's), USAID, and the international private sector. These included the Administration Officer and Deputy Team Leader of the USAID Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART) for two years in northern Iraq, and operations officer and program manager positions in the former Yugoslavia. He was the central Bosnia Program Manager for the UN International Police Task Force in 1996. Joe graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1984 with a Bachelor's degree in International Security and Public Affairs. He served in the U.S. Army until 1993.

**Donald Finn** is a Major in the U. S. Marine Corps who was selected for the Commandant of the Marine Corps one-year National Fellows program with USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA). He has 14 years experience in the military and participated in famine relief efforts in Somalia during Operation Restore Hope in 1992-1993. Major Finn is a graduate of Colorado State University.

**Judith Gilmore** assumed the directorship of the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation (PVC), Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, USAID, on April 24, 2000. After more than 20 years with USAID, Judy has returned to PVC, where she started out as a policy analyst in 1973. She then worked in the Office of Program, Policy, and Evaluation where, as chief of the Evaluation Unit, she designed and managed sector studies of voluntary agency projects in microenterprise and primary health care as well as institutional development and cost-effectiveness. Judy came to PVC from the Office of Regional Sustainable Development, Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, where she served as deputy director since 1997. Prior to that, she served as director of USAID's Office of East Asia Affairs (1994-97); deputy director of the Office of Sahel and West Africa Affairs (1991-94); deputy director for the Office of Technical Resources, Bureau for Africa (1990-91); and regional division chief for Latin American and then Africa in the Office of Food for Peace (1987-90). A graduate of Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, Washington, D.C., Judy also earned certificates in French and Spanish Translation from Georgetown University's Institute of Language and Linguistics, Washington, D.C. She received her Bachelor of Arts in French Literature from Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA.

**Hugh Goyder** is an independent consultant specializing in monitoring and evaluation issues. After completing an Msc. in Development Economics he worked as an economist in Unilever before becoming a UNICEF volunteer in India. From 1976-90 he worked for Oxfam, first in India, and then as Country Director for Ethiopia where he was responsible for Oxfam's programme during the famine of 1983-5. On returning to the UK in 1986 he took responsibility for evaluation in Oxfam, and from 1992-97 worked for the NGO ActionAid, first as Regional Manager for South & West Africa, and later as Coordinator for Impact Assessment. Since becoming a consultant in 1998 he has been involved in evaluations of NGO responses to both the 1999 Indian Cyclone and the 2001 Gujarat Earthquake and is currently leading a study of Monitoring in the whole humanitarian sector for ALNAP due for publication in early 2003. He is a long standing associate of the Oxford-based International NGO Training & Research Centre (INTRAC).

**Fernanda Guerrieri** holds an MSc in Agriculture and Forestry, from the University of Bologna and a Diploma in Watershed Management from the Institute for Aerial Survey and Earth Sciences (ITC), Enschede, The Netherlands. Since February 2002, she has been Chief of the Emergency Operations Service, Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). She began her career in 1982 as a consultant, and held numerous assignments between 1982 and 1988. These positions included research/consultation and teaching at the University of Bologna, Italy, working for the European Community and for UNICEF. Mrs. Guerrieri joined FAO in 1988 as Project Operations Officer in the Forestry Department, where she was responsible for the programs in Central America, Mexico, Panama, Cuba, Bolivia and Equatorial Guinea. From 1990 to November 1992 she was appointed as "Outposted" Deputy FAO Representative in Equatorial Guinea and from 1992 to 1995 she served as the Deputy FAO Representative in Côte d'Ivoire. From 1995 to 1998, she worked at the FAO Headquarters as a Project Analyst in the Technical Cooperation Department, and served as the FAO Representative in Vietnam from 1998 through January 2002.

**George Havens** is a pharmacist with the Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service, and currently detailed to USAID's Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA). CDR Havens spent 12 years providing clinical public health services on Native American reservations throughout the western United States, before joining OFDA in May 1999. CDR Havens began with OFDA as a member of the Health Team, providing technical assistance in the areas of public health and medical/pharmaceutical supplies. He is currently OFDA's Regional Coordinator for Europe, the Middle East, and Central Asia and has been focused on the situation in Afghanistan since doing an assessment trip in that country in April 2001. CDR Havens has been deployed on numerous assessments and disaster responses. Most recently, in response to the Afghanistan crisis, CDR Havens has filled the roles of Disaster Assistance Response Team Leader in Uzbekistan, Deputy Team Leader in Pakistan, and Acting USAID Mission Director in Afghanistan.

**Geert Heikens** received a Masters Degree in Economic Policies at the Groningen State University. In September 2000, Mr. Heikens took his post of Counselor for Development at the Delegation of the European Commission in Washington, DC. In the meantime, he was appointed Head of the Economic, Financial and Development Section. In this capacity, he ensures liaison with the US Administration (USAID and USDOS in particular), the World Bank, IMF, Inter-American Development Bank, etc. In 1987, Mr. Heikens joined the European Commission in Brussels. In the Directorate General for Development from 1997 to 2000, he was responsible for macroeconomic support programmes for the Caribbean and some Sub-Saharan African countries. Before that Mr. Heikens was in the Middle East and Southern Mediterranean Department in charge of social development programmes and was involved in the Middle East Peace Process. He started at the Commission by setting up cooperation programmes for small and medium-sized enterprises. From 1980 to 1987, Mr. Heikens followed a diplomatic career with the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs and served in Venezuela, the Dutch Ministry (European Economic Cooperation) and Singapore.

**Rick Hill** is the Director of Emergency and Transition Programs with Cooperative Housing Foundation (CHF) International. From 1990–2000 he was Deputy Director, and then Director, of Intertect Relief and Reconstruction Corporation. Mr. Hill has extensive experience in programs that reintegrate conflict affected populations in conjunction with economic and infrastructure reconstruction during and after disaster, often coordinating these programs with sensitive social and legal issues. In this regard, he managed a six-year study on this subject conducted by the Center for the Study of Societies in Crisis (now the Cuny Center), and later a study of the impact of USAID’s Relief Programs for USAID/CDIE. In these programs and others he has focused on supporting local capacities for recovery and management. He has a strong background in infrastructure reconstruction and substantial expertise – domestic and international - in housing and shelter, designing and/or managing shelter specific programs in numerous countries. He is the author, with Fred Cuny, of *Famine, Conflict, and Response* (Kumarian Press), and numerous monographs, articles, and reports on reconstruction and post-disaster issues.

**Michelle Jennings** comes to USAID’s Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance as a Special Projects Officer in the Operations Division/Military Liaison Unit. She has been working in the field of emergency management, relief, and development for the last 10 years. Previous to her arrival at OFDA, Michelle was involved with the DoD’s Domestic Preparedness Program (DPP), where she developed, facilitated, and presented tabletop and full-scale exercises involving scenarios detailing a biological, chemical, or nuclear terrorist attack. She has facilitated counter terrorism seminars and exercises for FEMA, DoD’s Improved Response Program, and the US Army’s SOF Army After Next War games. She collaborated as a Disaster Specialist with the World Bank Group in the post Hurricane Mitch agricultural assessments and worked with FEMA on the development of the Urban Search & Rescue Response System.

**Charles Kelly** is the Lead Researcher for the project that aims to develop REA methods and procedures, a training syllabus and a course book. Mr. Kelly has more than 22 years of experience in disaster management in more than 46 countries, working for a variety of NGOs, International Organizations and national governments. He is the author of more than 35 articles and papers on emergency management, including environment and disaster and the management of emergency field operations.

**Sureka Khandagle** serves as the Regional Coordinator for the Southern, West and North Africa Team (SWAN) in the Disaster, Response and Mitigation Division of the Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (USAID/DCHA/OFDA). In her capacity as the Regional Coordinator she manages and coordinates USAID's emergency response programs in the SWAN region, working closely with USAID regional bureaus, the Office of Food for Peace (DCHA/FFP), the State Department, the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD), other donor governments and international organizations to develop appropriate and timely USG responses to disasters. Prior to serving as the RC she served as the Program Officer for West and North Africa, conducting monitoring trips to Liberia, Guinea, Mali and Sierra Leone. During her five years at OFDA, she has also served as the Program Officer for the Europe, Middle East and Central Asia Republics Team (EMCA) managing the portfolios for Kosovo, Montenegro, Albania and Afghanistan as

well as served on OFDA's Disaster Assessment Response Teams (DART) to Kosovo and Macedonia. She holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science from the University of Maryland, and a Master of Arts in International Relations from Boston University.

**Vernon E. Kousky** is the chief of the Analysis Branch of the Climate Prediction Center, and specializes in monitoring global climate variability, especially that related to the El Niño/ Southern Oscillation (ENSO). Since 1984, Dr. Kousky has been chief editor of the monthly *Climate Diagnostics Bulletin*, which provides a description of global precipitation and atmospheric/ oceanic circulation anomalies, and a discussion of the latest forecasts for tropical Pacific sea surface temperature anomalies. His research interests include inter-annual and intra-seasonal climate variations, the El Niño - Southern Oscillation cycle, and synoptic climatology.

**Bobby Lambert** is Chief Executive of the London office of RedR, an international humanitarian relief organisation. A chartered engineer, he graduated from University College Dublin in 1979 and has an MSc from Imperial College in London. Most of his professional life has been spent working on development and humanitarian issues, with some 10 years field experience in East & Southern Africa. Following this, he spent several years teaching and researching at the University of East Anglia's School of Development Studies. He joined RedR in 1992 with responsibility for developing its training programme and technical support activities. In 1996, he became director of what is now the London office. He is also a board member of People in Aid.

**Lauren Landis** is the Director of the Office of Food for Peace for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). In this capacity she manages \$1 billion of food commodities that are programmed in over 100 countries worldwide. Prior to joining USAID, she spent six years as the Director of Emergency Response and Food Security at Save the Children Federation, Inc., a leading development and humanitarian U.S. Private Voluntary Organization. She also worked as Program Officer at Interaction, a coalition of U.S. non-profit organizations. Previous stints at USAID include serving as Emergency Operations Coordinator in Somalia and as a Disaster Operations Specialist in Washington, D.C. An alumna of Mount Holyoke College, where she majored in International Relations, Ms. Landis is a Term Member of the Council of Foreign Relations.

**Guy Lawson** received his Ingeniero Agrónomo degree from the University of Buenos Aires, Argentina, and his Ph.D. in Agricultural Botany from Reading University, UK. Since 2001, he has served as the Chief of Service for the Seed and Plant Genetic Resources Division within the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the UN (PGRFA). Prior to his posting with FAO, Dr. Martinez served as the Senior Advisor to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Argentina, negotiating the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP), the Biosafety Protocol (UNEP) and the International Treaty for PGRFA (FAO). He also served as Senior Officer in the Interim Secretariat to the Convention on Biological Diversity at Geneva, and as Director of the Institute of Biological Resources in the National Institute for Agriculture Technology (INTA). He was a member of the National Research Council of Argentina for developing research on

Agriculture Botany and Biosystematics of PGRFA, and supervised postgraduate students in the University of Buenos Aires. He has participated in projects on PGRFA in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Peru, Uruguay, and Chile, and has more than 60 publications concerning different aspects of PGRFA.

**Gail Lecce** is the DG Office's deputy director. She has a B.A. from Penn State University in English literature and a J.D. from Harvard Law School. Gail worked for a law firm in Hawaii before joining USAID in the Office of the General Counsel (GC) in 1979. Her USAID career has been split between GC and democracy officer positions. Assignments have included regional legal advisor for Central America (posted in Costa Rica), assistant general counsel for contracts, and head of the democracy offices in El Salvador and Honduras.

**COL Mark K. Littlejohn** currently serves in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict responsible for policy formulation and oversight of DoD's support to foreign consequence management. COL Littlejohn has served in a variety of command and staff positions in the United States and abroad and his military training includes completion of the Air Defense Officer Basic and Advanced Courses, Command and General Staff Officer Course, Armed Forces Staff College, and Army War College. In addition, he has completed the Airborne, Ranger, SERE, Jumpmaster, and 25<sup>th</sup> Division RECONDO courses.

**Alex Mahoney** currently serves on OFDA's Europe, Middle East, and Central Asia (EMCA) team as a Disaster Operations Specialist responsible for Europe and the Middle East as well as a backstop for EMCA's Afghanistan program. During his five years at OFDA Alex has served OFDA in the field as an Information Officer in Mexico, Thailand, Guinea, Angola, Albania, Indonesia, Mozambique, Eritrea, Pakistan, India, Uzbekistan, Afghanistan, and the West Bank and Gaza, as well as serving in Washington for a variety of natural disaster and complex emergency responses, including Afghanistan, Kosovo, and Hurricane Mitch. Previously Alex worked at the U.S. Committee for Refugees.

**John Marks** has worked with OFDA for 7 years, 5 in the field (Somalia and Sudan) and 2 in Washington. He is currently Regional Coordinator for East Africa, and also serves as Coordinator of the USAID Sudan Task Force. Prior to joining OFDA, John spent 14 years with a number of NGOs managing relief and development programs in the Horn of Africa, southern Africa and the Caucasus.

**Randolph Martin** is the Senior Director for Operations at the International Rescue Committee. Mr. Martin has 25 years of experience in international work, including Country Directorships in Sudan and Afghanistan during his 17 years with IRC. Mr. Martin has been actively involved with NGO staff security issues for many years. He has served on the InterAction Security Advisory Group since the mid-1990s, has authored several articles on the security of humanitarian aid workers and is frequently asked to speak on security issues in various humanitarian and academic fora.

**Arturo Martínez** received his Ingeniero Agrónomo degree from the University of Buenos Aires, Argentina, and his Ph.D. in Agricultural Botany from Reading University, UK. Since 2001, he has served as the Chief of Service for the Seed and Plant Genetic Resources Division within the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the UN (PGRFA). Prior to his posting with FAO, Dr. Martínez served as the Senior Advisor to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Argentina, negotiating the Convention on Biological Diversity (UNEP), the Biosafety Protocol (UNEP) and the International Treaty for PGRFA (FAO). He also served as Senior Officer in the Interim Secretariat to the Convention on Biological Diversity at Geneva, and as Director of the Institute of Biological Resources in the National Institute for Agriculture Technology (INTA). He was a member of the National Research Council of Argentina for developing research on Agriculture Botany and Biosystematics of PGRFA, and supervised postgraduate students in the University of Buenos Aires. He has participated in projects on PGRFA in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Peru, Uruguay, and Chile, and has more than 60 publications concerning different aspects of PGRFA.

**Gerald Martone** is Director of Emergency Response at the International Rescue Committee's Headquarters in New York. During the past ten years at IRC, Gerald has overseen emergency operations and assessments in Burundi, Liberia, Kosovo, Chechnya, Ingushetia, DR Congo, Bas Congo, Sierra Leone, Congo-Brazzaville, Rwanda, East Timor, West Timor, Aceh, Guinea-Bissau, Northern Uganda, Albania, Macedonia, Angola, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran, Kashmir, and Afghanistan. He served two elected terms as the Co-Chair of the Disaster Response Committee of InterAction. Gerald participated on the UN Inter-Agency Emergency Mission to East Timor and in 2000 participated in a UNHCR Mission to Angola. Currently Gerald is an Associate Professor at Columbia University's School of Public Health. In 1993, Gerald conducted field assessments in Monrovia, Liberia for the Friends of Liberia. He worked in Thal, Pakistan in 1988 and again in 1989 serving Afghan refugees in a surgical hospital and training Afghan Paramedics in basic emergency medical interventions. He served as a Peace Corps Volunteer, Preventive Medical Services, in Gbartala, Liberia from 1979-1982.

**Stephen McClelland** is currently Deputy Head of the Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs Department in the UK Department for International Development, London, a position he has occupied for one year. He has worked in other parts of the British Government, both as economist and administrator, as well as for labour unions at the OECD in Paris.

**Bernd McConnell** is Director of USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance. Prior to assuming his present position, he served as the Director of USAID's Central Asia Task Force created to coordinate and implement all USAID relief and reconstruction activities in Afghanistan, Pakistan and the Central Asia Republics. "Bear" McConnell served in the United States Air Force for over twenty-six years, including overseas service in the United Kingdom, South East Asia, and South Africa. An instructor, operations director, professor and several times a commander, he completed service as a Colonel and Command Pilot. Subsequently, he served in a variety of civilian capacities dealing with humanitarian assistance to the former Yugoslavia and regional policy. A member of the Department of State's thirty-ninth Senior Seminar, McConnell was Director of the Under

Secretary of Defense for Policy's Balkans Task Force. Next he was appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for African Affairs, shortly thereafter being dual-hatted as Principal Deputy, Assistant Secretary. Prior to assuming his present position, McConnell acted as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

**Anita Menghetti**, NGO/IO/Donor Coordinator for OFDA is responsible for ensuring over-all consistency in OFDA's policy with regard to NGOs and provides liaison between OFDA and the UN and other IOs. Previously she worked for the United Nations in positions that focused on coordination, with OCHA in Rwanda, Albania and New York, and with DPKO as the Humanitarian Planning Officer. From 1987 to 1994 Anita worked for several NGOs in refugee resettlement, policy and programming for targeted populations. She holds an M.A. in Women's studies and Public Policy from George Washington University and a B.A. in Women's Studies and History from U.C. Berkeley.

**Raymond E. Meyer** was a Senior Program Manager and Agricultural/Natural Resources Scientist in USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA). His primary responsibilities in OFDA's Division of Prevention, Mitigation, Preparedness and Planning (PMPP) included direction of the Technical Assistance Group of 20 technical specialists working with programs in natural and complex disasters. Previous to his affiliation with OFDA, he was with the Office of Agriculture in USAID's former Bureau for Research and Development where he had responsibility for global projects dealing with soil resources and dryland agricultural systems. Dr. Meyer began his 27-year international career by joining the Peace Corps as a volunteer in Peru. He remained in Peru subsequently with the International Potato Research Center as an agronomist and later with Utah State University as an irrigation agronomist. He also was research advisor for the Office of Water Resources in Peru's Ministry of Agriculture and adjunct professor of soils and irrigation in the National Agrarian University, La Molina. His first position was as a research plant physiologist with the USDA after being granted a PhD from Oklahoma State University.

**Peter Morris** is a Senior Disaster Management Supervisor and the team leader for the Technical Assistance Group at USAID/OFDA. He has over 20 years of international experience as nutrition coordinator and advisor. His overseas assignments include Zaire, Cambodia, Switzerland, Niger, and Thailand. He has worked with various organizations and NGOs including UNHCR, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent, World Vision, International Catholic Migration Commission, CARE Khao-I-Dang Refugee Camp. He was a research technician in Wayne State University Medical School, Michigan and National Institute of Health from 1977 to 1982. Mr. Morris holds an M.P.S. in International Development (Cornell University, 2000), an M.S. in Nutritional Science (University of Maryland, 1983), and B.A. in Biology (University of Michigan, 1977).

**COL Cassel J. Nutter, Jr.** is the Commander of the 122<sup>nd</sup> Rear Operations Center of the Georgia Army National Guard located in Savannah, Georgia. He earned his Bachelors degree in Business Administration from Cumberland University, and is a graduate of the Carl Vinson Institute University of Georgia for elected officials. Colonel Nutter served

as a Special Forces Team medic from 1966 until receiving his commission in July 1968. Colonel Nutter started a civilian career in West Virginia rising to a Manager in the marketing of industrial tools. Colonel Nutter's most recent assignment was the Commander Coalition Joint Civil-Military Operations Task Force, Afghanistan. After standing up the CJCMOTF in October 2001 he served as the Deputy Commander until assuming command in April 2002.

**Mary O'Mara** is currently Assistant Special Agent in Charge for Policy in the Headquarters Liaison and Special Investigations Division of the Office of Inspector General/Investigations. She has been a federal investigator for 29 years and has worked for USAID since 1987. She has served in OIG regional offices in Dakar and Budapest as well as Washington.

**Dr. Laura E. Powers** serves as the agriculture and food security technical advisor for USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA). She is responsible for both agriculture and livestock portfolios in all parts of the world, but spends most of her time addressing issues in Africa. Prior to working for OFDA, Dr. Powers spent six years directing the International Agriculture program at a small liberal arts university in Virginia, and doing research at Colorado State University in Fort Collins. She earned her PhD from the University of Florida in Entomology and Nematology, with a concentration in agronomy, working in Honduras for two years at the Panamerican School of Agriculture (El Zamorano) while doing her dissertation research.

**Harry G. Proctor** has an engineering background with over twenty-five years of international experience. He is presently the Coordinator of Natural Environments Group of OFDA's Technical Assistance Group, which seeks to promote disaster mitigation measures, especially those that are initiated in advance of an event, or can be incorporated into disaster response activities to help mitigate the impact of future events.

**Angela Raven-Roberts** is currently Director of Academics and Training at the Feinstein International Famine Center, Tufts University. She has extensive career experience working in the U.N. system and with NGO's in emergency program design and development. Prior to coming to Tufts, she was for eight years Senior Project Officer in the Office of Emergency Programmes with UNICEF, responsible for emergency program management in the Horn and Southern Africa. She also has done training and work for the United Nations Department of Peace-keeping Operations. She received a Ph.D. in anthropology from the University of Minnesota, a Master of Letters from Oxford University in social anthropology, and a B.A. from the London University School of Oriental and African Studies.

**Pablo Recalde** is currently on Loan from World Food Programme (WFP) to the UN Office of Coordination of Humanitarian affairs (OCHA) where he heads the Field Information Support Project, (FIS). In 1985 he joined the UN / WFP and worked as a project officer in Lesotho where he developed several food aid assisted projects and supported this work with computerized distribution allocation systems. In Mozambique, Mr. Recalde created one of the first geo-referenced databases for WFP. At WFP headquarters he originated and directed WFP's Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping Unit



(VAM). While working on VAM, he became involved in data and information management as a core component of Early Warning, Contingency planning, preparedness and response. He also developed into a strong supporter of interagency collaboration and with a group of technical officers from other UN agencies and donor governments, developed the Geographic Information Support Team (GIST), that has become a center piece for inter agency coordination of humanitarian preparedness and response and is spearheading the implementation of Humanitarian Information Centers (HICs).

**Leonard Rogers** is the Deputy Assistant Administrator for the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance at USAID. His responsibilities include overseeing the management of U.S. assistance programs for democracy and conflict prevention, emergency and development food aid, international disaster assistance, aid through private voluntary organizations, and to American schools and hospitals abroad. He has over 25 years experience at USAID in policy, budget and program management positions. He was a Peace Corps Volunteer in Eastern Nigeria and served in the U.S. Army in Vietnam.

**Juan Pablo Sarmiento** is the Technical Manager for OFDA/LAC's Training and Technical Assistance Program in LAC. He is a Medical Doctor with post-graduate studies in Disaster Management, Public Administration, Education and Nutrition. He has twenty-two years of professional experience in the field of risk and disaster management in Latin America and the Caribbean. During that time, Dr. Sarmiento has worked with the Pan American Health Organization, Colombian Red Cross, the Colombian Ministry of Health, and Colombian Civil Defense.

**Charles A. Setchell**, AICP, is the Urban Planning and Urban Disaster Mitigation Specialist at the US Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA), where he also serves as Emergency Shelter Specialist. He has more than twenty-five years of experience as a natural hazard mitigation specialist and urban, regional, housing, economic, environmental, and transportation planner, both in the US and other countries. His international experience includes work in the Philippines as a Peace Corps Volunteer, in Thailand as a Fulbright Scholar and MacArthur Foundation grantee, and elsewhere in Southeast Asia as a planning consultant. Since his arrival at OFDA in 1998, Mr. Setchell has helped design and implement a number of emergency relief and mitigation projects in several countries, and seeks to promote disaster reduction through the integration of relief and development activities. He has also made numerous presentations at training courses, meetings, and conferences, and published on a wide variety of topics.

**Jim Smith** is presently Geoscience Adviser at OFDA, is a Registered Geologist in the state of California, with more than twenty-five years experience. He provides guidance and technical assistance on program development, disaster response, and mitigation activities in the fields of earthquakes, volcanoes, landslides, and tsunamis to OFDA, NGOs, IOs, and other Bureaus in USAID. He serves as liaison with the US Geological Survey from which he is on loan. He explains and translates complex technical information on geohazards for OFDA and a wide variety of humanitarian organizations.

**Nate Smith** has provided support for USAID/OFDA and the greater humanitarian community through the provision of maps and geographic information to enhance understanding of crisis events and facilitate coordination since 1996. Nate has a bachelors degree in Geography from the University of Maryland, Baltimore County and prior to joining OFDA worked for Emergency Information Systems International. Through OFDA, Nate has supported response to numerous international disasters and has participated in response deployments to Kosovo, Mozambique, Turkey and Taiwan. Nate is also a local Disaster Action Team leader for the American Red Cross.

**Louise Sperling** is a seed system and agro-biodiversity specialist for the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT). She has worked in Africa and Asia for the last 25 years, specializing in plant breeding, seed system and integrated pest management strategies that support sustainable agriculture. She has extensive field experience working in agricultural and pastoral contexts and during periods of both acute and chronic stress situations (including inter alia war/drought/genocide in Ethiopia, DRC, Burundi, Rwanda and Kenya).

**Kelly Sponberg** is the coordinator of the Climate Information Project (CIP), at the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Office of Global Programs. CIP is jointly support by the USAID Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance and NOAA. Mr. Sponberg's efforts and interests have focused on issues of information access, particularly as pertains to rural people and hydro-meteorological information. He has also helped to design, implement, and manage the digital radio satellite broadcast of the RANET project, while engaging in various training and coordinating activities of the program. Mr. Sponberg has a Bachelors of Arts in Geosciences from Princeton University and is currently in a doctoral-track program in the Department of Geography at Rutgers University.

**Dr. Mark Stinson** is an Emergency and Family Physician at the Contra Costa Regional Medical Center (CCRMC) in Martinez, CA. As an Associate Clinical Professor his duties include staffing the Department of Emergency Medicine, supervising residents/ medical students, and providing medical oversight to the hospital/County disaster committees. He also serves as an instructor for CCRMC, CC County Health System and the State of CA Office of Emergency Services teaching courses on hospital disaster preparedness, wilderness medicine and Urban Search and Rescue (USAR). Dr. Stinson has served as Medical Team Manager to the Oakland-based FEMA USAR Team since 1995. He was recently asked to serve as the medical officer on the FEMA Incident Support Team for the World Trade Center deployment. Dr. Stinson's international disaster field experience includes deployments with various organizations including International Medical Corps [Bosnia and Honduras] and most recently Relief International [Afghanistan; Gujarat, India; Izmit, Turkey; Kosovo and Albania]. Dr. Stinson has a special interest in Wilderness, Travel and Tropical Medicine.

**David Taylor** has 33 years of management experience in development and relief activities. He spent 22 years working in a number of third world countries throughout Africa, the Middle East and Latin America and 11 years of international NGO

headquarters experience. Most recently he has been the Director of USAID's Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI) for the past 10 months.

**Rob Thayer** has been serving as OFDA's Regional Coordinator for Asia since April, 2002. Previously Rob worked with OFDA's Asia Regional Team as a Disaster Operations Specialist (program officer) for Southeast Asia since June 1999. In earlier years Rob served in Cambodia as an UN-funded Advisor to the Cambodian Red Cross (1991-1995) and with The Asia Foundation in Phnom Penh (1996-1998). During the 1980s Rob spent five years in Thailand with the International Rescue Committee and Joint Voluntary Agency (1983-1988), mainly on the Thai-Cambodian border. Rob has an M.A. in International Administration from the School for International Training in Brattleboro, Vermont.

**Marc Vincent** is the NGO secondee to the recently formed IDP Unit in OCHA. He is the former Coordinator of the Global IDP Project, an advocacy and information management project of the Norwegian Refugee Council. Prior to creating the Global IDP Project in 1998, he worked in the field with the High Commissioner of Human Rights in Rwanda and with the High Commissioner for Refugees in Former Yugoslavia and Burundi. He has published several articles on internally displaced issues in, for example, the forced Migration Review and Refugee Survey Quarterly. In 2001 he co-edited a book on Response Strategies of the Internally Displaced called "Caught between Borders."

**Mark Walsh** served thirty-four years in the U.S. Army. He was the Zone Director for United Nations Operations in Somalia (UNOSOM II) in Kismayo, Somalia and later became a member of the U.S. Army Peacekeeping Institute (USAPKI). In 1994 he worked with the United Nations Department of Humanitarian Affairs in Haiti and in 1995 he returned as a member of the first United Nations sponsored pre-mission training program for the United Nations Mission in Haiti (UNMIH). Later that year he was part of the United Nations Training Assistance Team (UNTAT) that trained the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM III) staff. In January 1996, he served with the Implementation Force (IFOR) in Bosnia providing strategic planning advice to the Office of the High Representative. He returned to Bosnia in August 1996 and September 1998 to assist the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) with its election missions. Later he served as a senior humanitarian coordinator for the United Nations Transitional Authority in East Timor (UNTAET). In November 2001 he represented the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) at United States Central Command (USCENTCOM) during the emergency phase of Operation Enduring Freedom until July 2002. He is currently the Center for Humanitarian Cooperation (CHC) representative at USCENTCOM.

**William P. Whelan** has managed the Famine Early Warning System Network (FEWS NET) for USAID since 1993. Prior service to USAID includes assignments as USAID Zambia's Agricultural Economist (1988-1993) and as Economist with the Nutrition Economics Group of USAID's Office of Nutrition (1984-1989). He was an Assistant Professor of Economics at Rutgers University (1981-1984) where he taught courses related to food problems. In addition, he has taught at The Catholic University of

America and has been a guest lecturer on world hunger food issues at Drake University, the University of Missouri at Columbia and the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture. Whelan holds a Ph.D. in Agricultural Economics (Michigan State University, 1981), an M.A. in Economics (Michigan State, 1979), and an M.S. in Agricultural Economics (The University of Illinois, 1977)."

**Roger P. Winter** is the Assistant Administrator for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA) of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Winter was director of USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance from May 2001 until assuming his present position in January of 2002. Before joining USAID, he served as executive director of the U.S. Committee for Refugees (USCR) from 1981 to 2001. USCR is a non-profit, humanitarian organization that works to protect and assist refugees, asylum-seekers and displaced people around the world. Winter has far-reaching field experience in Africa, Southeast Asia, the former Soviet Union, and Central America. He has researched and written extensively and conducted media outreach to raise the profile of refugee issues around the world. He also served as director of the U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement in the former Department of Health, Education and Welfare during portions of both the Carter and Reagan administrations. Prior to that, he worked 10 years as an official with the state of Maryland. His early career was devoted to anti-poverty and civil rights programs in Boston, Chicago and Central Connecticut.

**Matthew Wood** is the mapping specialist for the Survey Action Center, part of the Global Landmine Survey based in Washington, DC. Mr. Wood is a geographer who specializes in the use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and relational databases. Mr. Wood is responsible for producing maps that graphically display the results of the Global Landmine Surveys in a format that allows the data to be easily understood and analyzed by a layperson. From 1997 to March 2000, Mr. Wood worked in the civil engineering field, mapping water networks and metropolitan public transportation, using very similar technologies to the Survey Action Center. A citizen of both the U.K. and U.S.A., Mr. Wood studied in Belgium, England and Scotland, receiving a BA in Geography and European Studies from the University of Strathclyde in Glasgow, Scotland, in 1995.

**Giselle Zimmerman** is a Disaster Operations Specialist for the Latin America and Caribbean team of the Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance. She has been with OFDA since June 1999 and served as a Senior Information Specialist before her current position. Prior to coming to OFDA, Ms. Zimmerman was a Senior Program Officer with Relief International where she worked on USAID and other donor programs in Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, Burundi, Rwanda, and Vietnam.